

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

CONTENTS

	PAGE
DEIERKAUF-HOLSBOER, S. WILMA.—Les Représentations bilingues à l'Hôtel de Bourgogne en 1613,	217
HERRICK, MARVIN T.—Some Neglected Sources of 'Admiratio,'	222
OECHLER, WILLIAM F.—The Reception of Emile Verhaeren in Germany, Some Unpublished Letters of Stefan Zweig,	226
WATSON, WILFRED.—The Fifth Commandment; Some Allusions to Sir Robert Filmer's Writing in 'Tristram Shandy,'	234
KNICKERBOCKER, KENNETH L.—Browning and Swinburne: an Episode,	240
CORDASCO, FRANCESCO.—George Moore and Edouard Dujardin,	244
KIRBY, THOMAS A.—Irving and Moore: a Note on Anglo-American Literary Relations,	251
STURTEVANT, ALBERT MOREY.—Some Irregular Forms in Old Norse,	255
WOOLF, HENRY BOSLEY.—Chaucer 'Redeivus,'	258
WOOLF, HENRY BOSLEY.—Beowulf and Grendel: an Analogue from Burma,	261
SCHWEITZER, JEROME W.—Another Note on Dryden's Use of Georges de Scudéry's 'Almahide,'	262
ALDRIDGE, ALFRED OWEN.—Henry Needler's Knowledge of Shaftesbury,	264
THORPE, JAMES.—Authenticity of "The Wish" as a Rochester Poem,	267
VINCENT, HOWARD P.—An Attempted Piracy of 'The Duenna,'	268
MOUNTS, CHARLES E.—"Sooth" in De la Mare, Keats, and Milton,	271
WRIGHT, NATHALIA.—A Note on the Setting of Mary Noailles Murfree's "The 'Hart' That Walks Chilhowee,"	272
REVIEWS:—	
E. DE SELINCOURT and HELEN DARRISHIRE (eds.), The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth. [R. D. Havens.]	273
JANE WORTHINGTON, Wordsworth's Reading of Roman Prose. [J. W. Beach.]	274
MARJORIE HOPE NICOLSON, Newton Demands the Muse. Newton's "Opticks," and the Eighteenth Century Poets. [W. J. Bate.]	276
CHARLES A. PROUTY (ed.), Studies in Honor of A. H. R. Fairchild [M. W. Bundy.]	278
JULIA BASTIN et EDMOND FARAL (eds.), Onze Poèmes de Rutebeuf concernant la croisade. [E. B. Ham.]	280
HENRI CHAMARD, Georges Ascoli. [H. C. Lancaster.]	283
HOWARD WILLIAM TROYER, Ned Ward of Grubstreet: a Study of Sub-Literary London in the Eighteenth Century. [O. L. Day.]	284
BRIEF MENTION: HORATIO SMITH (ed.), Columbia Dictionary of Modern European Literature; The World of Learning; ELIZA PEARL SHIPPEN, Eugenia De Acton: 1749-1827; GEOFFREY TILLOTSON, The Moral Poetry of Pope; NATHAN COMFORT STARR, The Dynamics of Literature,	285
CORRESPONDENCE: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries,	288

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER
RAYMOND D. HAVENS
KEMP MALONE

C. S. SINGLETON
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas,
Arno Schirokauer, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JGPP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NND.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RHS.*, *FLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

Perfect Your FRENCH
IN THIS NATURAL FRENCH SETTING

At MCGILL UNIVERSITY
FRENCH SUMMER SCHOOL

MONTREAL, JUNE 27 TO AUGUST 8, 1947.



MCGILL'S popular, long-established French Summer School in Montreal enables teachers, students, and others to improve their French—for professional use or for business or pleasure—in a natural, attractive French atmosphere. Ideal also for advanced students of good intellectual ability who aim at graduate work in McGill. French alone spoken at all times. Teaching of exceptionally high standards by experienced university teachers. Resident scholarships. University credit certificates.

Fee (tuition, board and room) — \$200.00

Write today for prospectus to:—

DIRECTOR, FRENCH SUMMER SCHOOL
MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL, CANADA.

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXII

APRIL, 1947

Number 4

LES REPRÉSENTATIONS BILINGUES À L'HÔTEL DE BOURGOGNE EN 1612¹

Au début de l'année 1612, une troupe de comédiens italiens sous la direction de Jehan Paul Alfieri, chevalier de l'Empereur, vint à Paris. Cette compagnie, dont Compardon et Baschet² ignoraient l'existence a été signalée pour la première fois par M. Fransen³ qui a découvert un bail de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne où figure ce chef italien; toutefois de plus amples détails lui ont fait défaut. Comme cette troupe forma le dessein de donner des représentations dans la salle de la rue Mauconseil, dès son arrivée à Paris, elle n'eut donc rien de mieux à faire que de s'adresser directement aux Confrères de la Passion. Malheureusement ceux-ci ne purent guère satisfaire à leur désir, la grande salle de théâtre étant louée jusqu'au jour de carême-prenant à Valleran le Conte et sa troupe.⁴ L'unique solution pour les Italiens serait de jouer dans une autre salle à Paris après avoir obtenu l'autorisation des Maîtres et Gouverneurs de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne.

L'apparition de ces acteurs italiens dans la capitale jette la consternation dans la compagnie de Valleran le Conte: la situation de cette dernière était déjà désespérée. Au cours des six ans qui venaient de s'écouler, ils avaient essayé de gagner la sympathie du public pour les pièces du "théâtre nouveau" de leur poète à gages,

¹ Les documents ayant servi de base à cette étude ont été trouvés par nous aux Archives Nationales de Paris et seront reproduits intégralement dans notre *Vie d'Alexandre Hardy, poète du roi*, qui sera éditée par l'American Philosophical Society.

² *Les comédiens du roi de la troupe italienne*, Paris 1880; *Les comédiens italiens à la cour de France*, Paris 1882.

³ "Documents inédits," *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France*, 1927, p. 325.

⁴ *Id.*, p. 352.

Alexandre Hardy : tragédies, tragi-comédies, comédies⁵ et pastorales qui avaient eu tant de succès en province. Mais tous ces efforts demeurèrent infructueux. Nos comédiens continuent à jouer devant des salles désertes. Valleran le Conte lutte avec ténacité contre tant d'infortune; par des associations sans cesse renouvelées il a réuni les meilleurs comédiens de son temps,⁶ il n'a pas ménagé les dépenses consacrées aux costumes et aux décors; et son poète dont la fécondité créatrice ne ralentissait jamais à fournir à la troupe un répertoire d'une diversité inégalée. Tant d'énergie ne servit de rien; la plupart des Parisiens témoignèrent leur indifférence en délaissant la salle de théâtre. Evidemment les suites de ce déplorable état de choses ne manquèrent pas de se faire ressentir. Valleran le Conte est criblé de dettes; les acteurs de la troupe gênés par les maigres recettes ne savent comment joindre les deux bouts; les créanciers poursuivent la compagnie et son chef, la ruine est proche. En outre, les voilà menacés par la concurrence des comédiens italiens; les scénarios de la "Commedia all'improvviso" détourneront sans doute de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne les rares Parisiens qui le fréquentent.

Ces circonstances particulièrement pénibles amenèrent Valleran le Conte à se mettre en rapport avec Alfieri, le chef de la troupe italienne. Le directeur des Comédiens du Roi a l'intention d'éviter à tout prix l'installation de ses rivaux étrangers dans une autre salle.

Ce n'était pas la première fois que Valleran le Conte faisait appel aux Italiens. Un événement à peu près semblable s'était déjà produit douze ans plus tôt, en 1600, lorsqu'avaient échoué les premières tentatives faites, dans la capitale, afin d'obtenir l'approbation du public pour les poèmes d'Alexandre Hardy. A ce moment-là une troupe de comédiens italiens, inconnue jusqu'alors, arriva inopinément à Paris. Elle était sous la direction de Ricci et Saullo Donati. Ceux-ci d'une part, et Valleran le Conte et son compagnon Savinien Bony d'autre part, signèrent l'acte d'association du 25 février 1600.⁷ Dans la représentation des pièces italiennes ces deux acteurs français tinrent des rôles. Ils touchèrent deux parts et demie des bénéfices, tandis que les Italiens obtinrent six

⁵ Voir notre *Vie d'Alexandre Hardy*.

⁶ Nous avons eu la chance d'exhumer six actes d'association de Valleran le Conte.

⁷ Archives Nationales, Fonds xv, 9.

parts. M. Agnès Beijer, en étudiant les gravures du *Recueil de Fossard*, avait déjà supposé, en 1928, que les Italiens s'étaient associés à des farceurs français.⁸ Cette thèse manquait de preuves. Nous savons que c'est un fait avéré maintenant. Cette première collaboration de Valleran le Conte avec les Italiens a probablement facilité les pourparlers avec Alfieri.

Cette fois-ci Valleran ne propose pas au chef étranger de jouer ensemble dans les mêmes pièces; il désire combiner les représentations des deux troupes à l'Hôtel de Bourgogne. La troupe française et la compagnie italienne donneront chacune leur propre pièce à la même représentation; les Italiens n'auront pas à contribuer au paiement du loyer de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne; celui-ci reste entièrement à la charge de Valleran le Conte et ses comédiens conformément au bail passé avec les Confrères; les sommes recueillies à l'entrée seront glissées dans une caissette soigneusement fermée et le partage de la recette entre les deux troupes se fera, par portions égales, après chaque représentation. Alfieri accepte ce projet alléchant. C'est ainsi que Paris eut l'avantage de jouir de représentations bilingues, se composant d'une tragédie, d'une tragi-comédie ou d'une pastorale d'Alexandre Hardy suivie immédiatement d'une comédie italienne.

Cette nouveauté fut, dès le premier instant, au goût du public et la recette parut assez importante au début. Ce dernier fait peut se déduire aisément de la façon d'agir des Confrères de la Passion. Valleran le Conte, comme nous le savons, avait pris à sa charge le paiement du loyer de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne, mais il avait omis, le 31 janvier 1612, de s'acquitter des dernières cent cinquante livres tournois. Les Confrères, qui étaient passés maîtres dans l'art de forcer les comédiens au paiement, désiraient ardemment s'emparer de la fameuse "boîte" contenant les deniers provenant d'une représentation bilingue. Une forte somme devait certainement s'y trouver. Les Maîtres et Gouverneurs de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne obtinrent que M^e Pierre Jacquet, commissaire et examinateur au Châtelet, procède à la saisie de la boîte "dedans laquelle y a quelques deniers provenus des jeulx qui furent représentez aud. Hostel de Bourgogne le jour de dimanche dernier par lesd. Alfieri, le Conte, Husson et autres."⁹ Il ressort du texte de cette minute que les Italiens et les Français ont joué ce même dimanche. Cependant

⁸ P. 20.

⁹ Archives Nationales, Fonds xv, 22.

les Confrères n'osent pas ouvrir la caissette sans autorisation préalable. C'est que son contenu n'appartient pas uniquement à Valleran le Conte, leur débiteur, mais aussi aux Italiens qui ne leur sont redevables de rien. Par l'acte de consentement du 14 février 1612¹⁰ Jehan Paul Alfieri "en son nom que pour ceulx de sa compaignée, comédiens italiens, et Valleran le Conte et Claude Husson, tant en leurs noms que pour leurs compagnons aussi comédiens," donnent le droit aux Confrères d'ouvrir la caissette. "Les deniers qui se trouveront dedans lad. bouette soient baillez et dellivrez ausd. Maîtres et gouverneurs de l'Hostel de Bourgogne sur et tant moins de ce qui leur est deub par lesd. le Conte et consorts à cause du lieu de la salle dud. Hostel de Bourgogne."

Alfieri et ses comédiens ont acquiescé, il est vrai, à l'ouverture de la caissette, mais lésés dans leurs intérêts par les Confrères qui les privent de la sorte de revenus ce dimanche-là ils cherchent à se mettre à l'abri de mécomptes semblables. Ils exigent des Confrères de leur assurer qu'ils ne toucheront plus à leur part de la recette. Aussi la clause suivante est-elle insérée dans cet acte de consentement: les Maîtres et Gouverneurs de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne "ont promis doresnavant ne faire saisir ny accepter les deniers qui appartiendront aud. Alfieri et sa compaignée provenant desd. jeulz en quelque sorte que ce soit."

D'autres faits établissent le succès qu'eurent au commencement les représentations bilingues dans l'unique grande salle de théâtre de Paris. Le 14 février 1612, le même jour donc où les Italiens autorisent les Confrères à s'emparer des deniers contenus dans la caissette, les comédiens de la *Commedia all' Improviso* et leurs camarades français signent un acte d'association.¹¹ Alfieri agit au nom de sa compagnie; les comédiens français par contre sont tous présents lors de cet événement mémorable; nous comptons parmi eux Valleran le Conte, Claude Husson, sieur de Longueval, Nicolas Gasteau, damoiselle Rachel Trépeau, Guillaume Desforges, Savinien Bony et Jacques Mabilie. Les deux troupes s'associent "pour jouer et représenter ensemblement ou separement toutes sortes de comedies, tragedcomedies, pastoralles et autres jeulx qu'ilz adviseront bon estre aud. Hostel de Bourgogne à la charge que les deniers qui proviendront de la représentation desd. jeulz apres les fraiz au

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ Archives Nationales, Fonds xv, 22.

préalable desduictz et rabattuz seront prins et partagez par eulx assavoir par led. Alfieri tant pour luy que ceulx de sa compaignée la moytié et par le Conte et ses consortz l'autre moytié." Les comédiens italiens, ayant appris que plusieurs créanciers pourchassaient Valleran le Conte, se préservent d'éventuels dommages en faisant stipuler dans l'acte d'association que "sy apres aulcun des creantiers desd. le Conte et ses consors faisoient saisir et arrester les deniers provenant desd. jeulz en ce cas celui sur lequel led. saisie et arrest aura esté fait sera tenu paier les fraiz d'icellui et autres consequence et en acquitter et garantir les autres de lad. compaignée."

La date d'expiration du bail de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne, contracté par Valleran le Conte, se situe au jour de carême-prenant 1612. Les deux troupes tenant à continuer leurs représentations, Valleran le Conte et Jehan Paul Alfieri passent un nouveau bail le 9 mars, qui leur donne le droit de jouer dans la salle de la rue Mauconseil No. 16, du 8 mars au samedi, veille du dimanche de la Passion 1612.¹²

Toutes ces représentations bilingues finirent sans doute par être trop nombreuses pour le public parisien. La curiosité des spectateurs d'abord éveillée par la nouveauté du double spectacle finit par s'affaiblir. Même les comédies italiennes n'avaient pu à la longue attirer les Parisiens de l'époque aux représentations des poèmes dramatiques de Hardy. Les spectateurs préférèrent de beaucoup voir le ventre prodigieux de Gros-Guillaume sur la scène de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne. On assistait de moins en moins au genre de spectacle de Valleran le Conte, et finalement les deux troupes jouaient devant une salle vide.

Alfieri et sa compaignie disparaissent sans doute encore avant la fin de la durée du bail de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne. Il nous a été impossible de retrouver leur trace. Pour la troupe des Comédiens du Roi de Valleran le Conte qui avait fourni avec tant d'enthousiasme tous ses efforts pour faire réussir les représentations bilingues, dernier moyen de salut imaginé par leur chef, la déception fut trop grande. La ruine dont elle était menacée depuis si longtemps devint inévitable. Les membres de la compaignie française, après avoir partagé toutes les infortunes de leur directeur Valleran le Conte, se détournèrent de lui. Ils avaient assez de leur directeur

¹² Documents inédits, p. 352.

obéré de dettes, des pièces du "théâtre nouveau" et de son poète-acteur Alexandre Hardy.

La troupe se dissocie; un seul membre, Jacques Mabilie, reste fidèle à Valleran le Conte. Peu de temps après les autres se sont regroupés sous la conduite de Robert Guérin. Ce que les tragédies, les tragi-comédies, les comédies et les pastorales de Hardy, et même les représentations bilingues n'ont pu réaliser, les rudes farces facétieuses de Gros-Guillaume, de Gaultier Garguille et de Turlupin l'effectuèrent. La salle de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne fut bondée de spectateurs pouffant de rire.

Valleran le Conte et Alexandre Hardy n'en furent pas témoins, ils avaient quitté Paris, ainsi que les comédiens italiens.

S. WILMA DEIERKAUF-HOLSBOER

Viroflay, S.-et-O.

SOME NEGLECTED SOURCES OF *ADMIRATIO*

The commonly accepted explanation of how the arousing of *admiratio* came to be one of the important offices of the poet is that Minturno, in 1559, first added *admiratio* to "teaching, moving, and delighting,"¹ and that Scaliger,² in 1561, confirmed this addition.

Spingarn³ and Gregory Smith⁴ have led us to believe that Minturno applied *admiratio* to poetry in general and that the particular application of admiration to the function of tragedy came with the French critics of the seventeenth century, such as Corneille, Boileau, and Saint-Évremond. Professor Gillet, in fact, has stated that Corneille was the first to add *admiratio* to the tragic catharsis.⁵

Although I formerly accepted this explanation, I have long sus-

¹ Minturno, *De Poeta* (Venice, 1559), p. 106: Illud autem ne te prae-tereat uelim, sic poetis esse dicendum, ut siue doceant, siue oblectent, siue moueant, haec singula statim admiratio legentis, audientisue consequatur.

² *Poetices* 3. 97: "The play is not acted solely to strike the spectator with admiration or consternation . . . but should also teach, move, and please." (Padelford's translation.)

³ *A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance* (New York, 1912), pp. 52-53.

⁴ *Elizabethan Critical Essays* (Oxford, 1904), I, 392-393.

⁵ J. E. Gillet, "A Note on the Tragic 'Admiratio,'" in *MLR*, XIII (1918), 236.

pected that there was more to the problem than Minturno and followers. Upon better acquaintance with Minturno's *De Poeta* I came to doubt that the author ever introduced an original conception in literary criticism. It is doubtless true that Minturno was influential. It is true that Minturno did maintain that all good poetry, even lyric poetry,⁶ should arouse admiration in the reader and listener. Moreover, although this fact has seldom been recognized, Minturno connected admiration, not only with teaching, delighting, and moving, but specifically with pity and fear as well. The tragic poet, according to Minturno, arouses admiration as he moves either terror or pity.⁷ But Minturno, if he was following his normal practice, was probably echoing other critics both ancient and contemporary. If one looked long enough, he doubtless would find earlier, and better, sources for the *admiratio* of the Renaissance.

The most important classical basis for the sixteenth-century *admiratio* was Aristotle's term τὸ θαυμαστόν, the "marvelous," usually translated into Latin as *admirabile* or *admiratio*. Bywater's version of *Poetics* 25. 1460^a11-18 runs as follows:

The marvelous is certainly required in Tragedy. The Epic, however, affords more opening for the improbable, the chief factor in the marvelous, because in it the agents are not visibly before one. The scene of the pursuit of Hector would be ridiculous on the stage—the Greeks halting instead of pursuing him, and Achilles shaking his head to stop them; but in the poem the absurdity is overlooked. The marvelous, however, is a cause of pleasure, as is shown by the fact that we all tell a story with additions, in the belief that we are doing our hearers a pleasure.

Aristotle also suggested a connection between *admiratio* and the pity and fear of tragedy:

Tragedy, however, is an imitation not only of a complete action, but also of incidents arousing pity and fear. Such incidents have the very greatest effect on the mind when they occur unexpectedly and at the same time in consequence of one another; there is more of the marvelous in them than if they happened of themselves or by mere chance.

(*Poetics* 9. 1452^a1-6)

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 382.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 179: et permouet uehementer, cum excitat admirationem, siue in terrorem, siue in commiserationem, siue in utrumque adducit. Cf. p. 180: Verum enim eiusmodi hoc rerum genus esse plane intelliget, qui huius poetae munus esse animaduertet, in admirationem adducere auditorem. Admiranda uero esse, quae uel afferunt miserationem, uel terrorem ineunt.

Minturno's "teach, delight, and move," which he coupled with admiration, suggests a rhetorical influence; the phrase points to Cicero as well as to Horace. Since rhetoric was still dominant in literary criticism during the sixteenth century, it would be surprising had rhetorical theory not contributed something to the establishment of *admiratio* as a proper function of poetry and as a proper accompaniment to pity and fear.

If we turn to Robortelli, whose great commentary on Aristotle's *Poetics* appeared in 1548, eleven years before Minturno's *De Poeta*, and who was a much sounder and more original thinker than Minturno, we find important evidence that the Renaissance conception of *admiratio* was rhetorical as well as poetic. In his discussion of the marvelous in poetry Robortelli referred to a passage in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*:

¹ Learning and admiring are as a rule pleasant; for admiring implies the desire to learn, so that what causes admiration (*θαυμαστόν*) is to be desired.⁸

Madius (1550),⁹ who doubtless followed Robortelli here, quoted the same passage in his commentary on the *Poetics*, and Piccolomini (1575),¹⁰ who followed Madius, also referred to the *Rhetoric*. Madius added a parallel from Plato's *Theaetetus* (155 D): "Men are moved to the study of wisdom by wonder." In another section of his commentary (p. 164) Robortelli sought confirmation from the Greek rhetorician Hermogenes, whose name at least was familiar to every schoolmaster in the Renaissance.¹¹ Robortelli quoted a passage on admiration from Hermogenes' essay, "On the Means of Forcefulness" (*Περὶ μεθόδου δυνάμειος* 36):

In Tragedy there is a blend of pity and admiration (*θαῦμα*), which may be perceived in tragedies themselves, but above all in Homer, who, Plato has said, is indeed the father and leader of Tragedy. We find, therefore, in exordiums the Homeric mingling of pity and admiration.

⁸ 1. 11. 21. Freese's translation. See Robortelli, *In Librum Aristotelis de Arte Poetica, Explicationes* (Florence, 1548), p. 283.

⁹ Madius and Lombardus, *In Aristotelis Librum de Poetica Communes Explanationes* (Venice, 1550), pp. 263-264.

¹⁰ *Annotationi . . . nel Libro della Poetica d'Aristotele* (Venice, 1575), p. 387.

¹¹ Every teacher of rhetoric was at least familiar with Priscian's translation of Hermogenes' *Progymnasmata*.

The Latin version in Sturm's popular edition (1571) of Hermogenes runs as follows:

In Tragoedia coniunctio est doloris, et admirationis, quod est videre in ipsis Tragoedijs: sed in primis in versibus Homeri, hunc enim, Plato dixit, patrem esse Tragoediae, et ducem. Inuenimus igitur in exordijs, Homericarum orationum mixtum dolorem cum admiratione.¹²

Eleven years, then, before Minturno published, Robortelli had anticipated both the union of admiration with the delight of poetry (and oratory) and the union of admiration with the pity and fear of tragedy. "All things pitiful and terrible, then," Robortelli remarked, "are admirable, nor does pity or terror ever lack admiration."¹³ Again: "All pity, terror, and admiration originates from a speech that expresses character."¹⁴ And again: "Tragic actions are constructed from the pitiful, the fearful, and the marvelous (or admirable)."¹⁵

Although Aristotle and Hermogenes were important rhetorical authorities in the sixteenth century, there was another classical rhetorician who was quite as important and much better known, namely, Cicero. We might reasonably expect scholars and critics in the middle of the century to bring Cicero into the discussion of *admiratio*. And so they did. Thomas Cooper, for example, in his *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae* (London, 1565), drew most of his illustrations of *admiratio* from Cicero. Victorius, whose commentary on Aristotle's *Poetics* was first published in 1560, referred to the statements on *admiratio* in the first book of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and then quoted a passage from Cicero's *Partitiones Oratoriae* (6. 22) as confirmation of Aristotle's *θαυμαστόν*:

An oration becomes agreeable when you say anything unexpected or unheard of or novel; for whatever is wonderful (*admirabile*) brings delight.¹⁶

¹² *Hermogenis . . . de Ratione Tractandae Grauitatis Occultae Liber* (Strassburg, 1571), p. 75.

¹³ Omnia igitur miserabilia, et terribilia sunt etiam admirabilia, neque vnquam commiseratio, aut terror caret admiratione (*op. cit.*, p. 99).

¹⁴ Omnis autem commiseratio, terror et admiratio, ex oratione morata proficiscitur (*ibid.*, p. 165).

¹⁵ τὰ φοβερὰ, τὰ ἐλεεινὰ, τὰ θαυμαστὰ, ex quibus actiones tragicæ constituentur (*ibid.*, p. 164). Cf. *ibid.*, p. 100.

¹⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 9, 32; *De Oratore* 1. 33. 152; *Brutus* 53. 198; *Orator* 57. 192. See Petri Victorii *Commentarii in Primum Librum Aristotelis de Arte Poetarum, Secunda Editio* (Florence, 1573), p. 257. Victorius acknowledges a debt here to Robortelli.

Plato, Aristotle, Hermogenes, Cicero; of the leading classical authorities on rhetoric and poetic in the Renaissance only Horace and Quintilian are missing. Obviously, I think, Minturno's conception of *admiratio* was merely the conventional one of his generation, a conception based upon Aristotle, with aid from Cicero, Plato, Hermogenes, and sixteenth-century interpreters of classical rhetoric and poetic. Certainly Robortelli, for one, anticipated virtually every interpretation of *admiratio* that Minturno and his followers advanced.

MARVIN T. HERRICK

University of Illinois

THE RECEPTION OF ÉMILE VERHAEREN IN GERMANY, SOME UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF STEFAN ZWEIG

The efforts of Stefan Zweig to make the works of Émile Verhaeren known in Germany and Austria are interestingly revealed in a collection of fifty-eight letters and postcards from Zweig to Julius Bab, the German dramatic critic and author, in the Houghton Library at Harvard University. The collection contains material from the years 1909 to 1924.

Zweig became interested in the works of the Belgian poet at the early age of 17,¹ and was just finishing his critical study, *Émile Verhaeren* (Leipzig 1910), at the time of the first letter in the collection, 9 August 1909. This first letter announces the themes which recur constantly: Zweig's great admiration for Verhaeren, his efforts and those of his friends in Verhaeren's behalf, and the indifference of the critics in general:

Sehr verehrter lieber Herr Bab, ich kann Ihnen gar nicht sagen, wie sehr ich Ihnen für Ihren guten Brief dankbar bin. Denn er kam in einer rechten Stunde.

Seit Jahren ist mir das Werk Verhaerens höchster Besitz—höchste Pflicht. Da ich fühle, dass Alles was ich selbst schaffe, lange noch nicht auf jener Höhe steht, wo neben der künstlerischen Schönheit auch irgend eine höhere Wirkung, eine moralische sich ergibt, habe ich erkannt, dass ich am besten

¹ Cp. *Erinnerungen an Émile Verhaeren*, Leipzig 1927, pp. 13 ff., a reprint of the privately printed edition referred to later in the letters; also *Die Welt von Gestern* (English translation: *The World of Yesterday*, New York 1943), *passim*, for Zweig's account of his relations with Verhaeren.

wirksam sein kann, wenn ich meine Kräfte an dieses Werk helfend wende. Ich habe das unvergleichliche Glück, zu sehen, wie Verhaeren in den Jahren, seit ich ihm zur Seite treten durfte, ungeahnt über seine Möglichkeiten emporgewachsen ist, habe das Reifen jenes Buches "La multiple Splendeur" nahe erlebt, das mir das schönste Buch unserer Zeit, das bedeutendste lyrische Werk seit Whitmans "Leaves of Grass" erscheint. Die Freundschaft Verhaerens ist mir der höchste Dank für meine Bemühung geworden, sein Werk hängt mit meinem Wirken heute inniger zusammen als Sie es denken können. Und ich sage ruhig, dass ich Alles, was an mir menschlich gut ist, seiner Nähe, seinem auch persönlich unvergleichbarem Beispiel danke.

In dem Moment da Sie mir schrieben legte ich letzte Hand an ein grosses Buch über Verhaeren, das im Frühling Französisch und Deutsch erscheinen soll. Ich will auch vom Verleger meine Übertragung zurückkaufen, um sie gleichzeitig mit dieser Studie seiner Entwicklung und seiner neuen heroischen Weltanschauung vielfach verbessert und vergrössert in gleichem Verlage erscheinen zu lassen. Dieses Buch soll meine Propaganda, die bisher meist persönlich war, eröffnen. Sie wissen nicht, wie sehr ich mutlos war, dass in Deutschland gerade die Besten der Kritik schwiegen, schwiegen, schwiegen! Kerr, Sie, Polgar, Wiegler, alle die doch die französische Literatur kannten, nannten nie seinen Namen. Hätte nicht Ellen Key durch fortwährende Mahnung das Buch zu schreiben, Rilke durch gütigen Zuspruch, Dehmel durch seine Begeisterung mich verwegener gemacht, ich hätte es nie geschrieben. Denn ein Trompetenstoss in eine Stille klingt zu grell.

So mutlos war ich, dass ich das Angebot eines Theater-vertriebes in diesen Tagen zurückwies. Erstlich glaube ich nicht an die Aufführbarkeit wegen der lesbischen Szenen.² Und dann: die Dramen Verhaerens sind von secundärer Bedeutung in seinem Werk. Und ich will ihn nicht zuerst von seiner angreifbaren Seite zeigen. Es wäre mir leicht gewesen seinen *Philippe II* in einer Übertragung aufführen zu lassen: aber die Kritik hätte ihn durch den Vergleich mit Don Carlos erschlagen.³ Ich warte lieber. Sein Ruhm ist unausbleiblich, eine der grossen Gewissheiten meines Lebens. Dann wird es noch immer Zeit sein. Er selbst ist nie danach gierig gewesen und freut sich über nichts so sehr als über die Stimmen die aus Deutschland kommen. Ich will ihm Ihren Namen sogleich nennen, damit Sie von nun ab alle seine neuen Bücher erhalten, möglichst von ihm selbst. Wenn Sie "La multiple Splendeur" noch nicht besitzen, will ich es auch versorgen.

Ein anderes Drama Verhaerens "Le Cloître" das bedeutsamste hat Oppeln-Brownikowski soeben übersetzt. Es ist selbstverständlich aufführbar,

² In *Hélène de Sparte*, of which the German translation by Zweig (*Helenas Heimkehr*) appeared in 1909.

³ In reviewing what is called the "deutsche Uraufführung" of *Philipp II* in Munich on 26 November 1912, one critic actually compared the play very favorably with Schiller's tragedy. Cp. *Die schöne Literatur*, 13 Jg., 1912, p. 452.

sogar ungemein wirksam und doch—er findet kein Theater. Reinhardt hat ihn im Stich gelassen und der Name Verhaeren gilt noch zu wenigen. Aber das wird sich ändern.

Vielen Dank nochmals. Sie wissen nun, warum ich mich Ihnen so sehr verpflichtet fühle. Ihre Zustimmung bedeutet mir so viel—weil sie mir fehlte. Wenn nun Sie, der wie Keiner Lyrik zu werten wissen, zu denen sich zählen, die Verhaeren als den Grössten nennen, fühle ich mich doppelt sicher. Wie schön von Ihnen, über das Literarische hinaus, sich direkt an mich zu wenden. Ich will es Ihnen nie vergessen. . . .

(P. S., on the envelope)

Seit zwei Jahren mühe ich mich eine Vortragstournée V[erhaeren]s zustande zu bringen. Wien hätte ich, Prag auch, München wahrscheinlich, Hamburg will Dehmel vorbereiten, aber Berlin? Und das dürfte doch nicht fehlen! *

As this letter shows, Zweig was not without support in his sponsorship of Verhaeren. Dehmel, Rilke, Stefan George, Hofmannsthal, Johannes Schlaf—one of the first in Germany to write about Verhaeren⁵—are perhaps the best known among the appreciative German audience. Rilke early admired Verhaeren, knew him in Paris, and refers to him in his correspondence.⁶ Ellen Key, who established the reputation of the young Rilke in Scandinavian countries, wrote an appreciative essay on Verhaeren.⁷

Thus, with such support, it is not strange to find later critics and scholars regarding the reception of Verhaeren in Germany as almost a universal, spontaneous movement. Frets, for example, in discussing the spread of Verhaeren's works throughout Europe, points to Germany as the most receptive country, and cites many letters.⁸ Bithell, in remarking on Verhaeren's popularity in Germany, says that he "everywhere received one-thousand marks a lecture."⁹ The present letters, however, reveal a somewhat truer picture of the facts and reflect great credit on the persistence of Zweig.

* Only the portions of the letters referring to Verhaeren have been reproduced. Minor, obvious corrections have been made.

⁵ *Emile Verhaeren*, Berlin 1905.

⁶ Cp. Br. 24 Nov. 1905; 19 May 1906; 12 Dec. 1921 (wherein Rilke comments on his being engrossed in *Les villes tentaculaires* during his early days in Paris), et al.

⁷ Cp. *Seelen und Werke, Essays von Ellen Key*, Berlin 1911, 63 ff.

⁸ Huberta Frets, *L'Élément germanique dans l'œuvre d'Emile Verhaeren*, Paris, 1935, pp. 6 ff.

⁹ Jethro Bithell, *Contemporary Belgian Literature*, London, 1915, p. 109.

Lieber Herr Bab, ich freue mich sehr, dass Verhaeren meinen Wunsch erfüllt und Ihnen "La Multiple Splendeur" gesandt hat. Ich wusste Ihnen nicht besser zu danken, als Ihnen ein Buch, das beste Buch unserer Zeit vom Autor gegeben zu wissen—und Sie haben es verdient. An wie viele habe ich mich vergebens gewandt, sie möchten sich einem so grossen Werk befreunden—und Sie taten es so schön, so jubelnd ganz ohne Bitte. Ich will Ihnen einmal erzählen, wie wichtig mir gerade in jenem Augenblick Ihre Zustimmung war. . . .¹⁰

Another letter (undated) from November or December 1910:

Lieber Herr Bab, ich muss Ihnen wirklich innig und aufrichtig dankbar sein. Nicht nur, dass Sie in Bonn eingesprungen sind und V[erhaeren] einen Erfolg gewonnen haben, scheinen Sie noch durch Ihren schönen Eifer den Ärger der klugen Leute auf sich zu laden. Denn mir scheint der Artikel Eloessers im Litt. Echo.¹¹ ein wenig Ihre Verhaeren-glossen¹² zu visieren: doch was tuts? Eloesser ist einer von denen, die in dem Irrtum leben Lyrik sei identisch mit dem Lied; und dass er gerade eine matte Stelle aus Verhaerens Versen herauskrabbelt ist ja seine Schuld. Ich glaube, die Opposition der gescheiterten Leute gehört zu jedem Erfolg wie die Donner zum Blitz (sonst wär's eben nur Wetterleuchten) und es gibt eben kein neues Weltgefühl, das den Weisen nicht bedenklich wäre. Als ob es möglich wäre Überzeugungen zu säuseln und Religion zu lispeln: Überzeugung braucht Pathos, selbst Rhetorik. Aber Ihnen muss ich's ja nicht erklären, Sie fühlen es ja besser wie jeder.

Ich danke Ihnen auch innig für die guten Worte über mein Buch. Ich mag es selbst nicht mehr lesen und freue mich sehr darüber von anderen zu hören: ich rühre jetzt keinen Finger, um zu prüfen ob der Schwung, den ich gegeben habe, stark genug war, um das Interesse ins Rollen zu bringen. Es scheint gelungen zu sein.

Max Montor hat in Hamburg zwei Stücke unter grosser Begeisterung vorgelesen, das Deutsche Volkstheater in Wien plant *das Kloster* obenso Knapil (ein prächtiger Mensch!) im Czechischen Nationaltheater, Prof. R. M. Meyer kündigt mir einen Essay in Velhagen & Klassing an.¹³ Am meisten freue ich mich natürlich auf Ihren Essay: nicht minder Verhaeren, der Ihnen sehr dankbar ist und mir viele Grüsse an Sie aufgetragen hat. Bahr wird nächstens Gedichte öffentlich vorlesen. . . .

As late as 3 January 1912 there is the following:

¹⁰ 29 September 1909.

¹¹ *Das literarische Echo*, 13. Jg, III, 208, 1 Nov. 1910. Arthur Eloesser, in reviewing unfavorably the performance of *das Kloster* in Berlin, 23 Sept. 1910, was critical of Verhaeren's poetry in general.

¹² *Die Schaubühne*, Nr. 40, 1910.

¹³ *Velhagen und Klassing Monatshefte*, xxvi, 10.

. . . Verhaeren wird bestimmt nach Berlin kommen, leider aber nicht als Vorleser, denn es hat sich bisher—hören und staunen Sie!—kein Verein gefunden, der ihm 400 Mark für einen Abend gewidmet hätte. Ich fragte bei Cassirer an, der allerdings anbot, ihm den Saal und Reklame gratis zur Verfügung zu stellen, von einem Honorar aber nichts wissen und Verhaeren das Risiko überlassen wollte. Ich kann nicht umhin, das sehr seltsam zu finden und glaube, Sie sind da meiner Meinung. . . .

And following this, on 21 February 1912:

. . . Ich muss meine Abreise vorbereiten, die mich nach Hamburg zu Verhaerens Vorlesung führt. In Berlin ist es bis zur Stunde noch nicht gelungen, einen Vortrag durchzusetzen und so wird Verhaeren wahrscheinlich nur als Privatmann nach Berlin kommen. Er hat mir zwar die Absicht ausgedrückt, mit möglichst wenig Menschen zusammenzukommen, aber Sie lieber Bab gehören ja nicht zu den Menschen sondern zu den Freunden und ich werde alles tun, um Sie rechtzeitig zu verständigen.

Zweig's enthusiasm seems merely to have been strengthened by the critics' adverse criticism and indifference, and, as he worked diligently on his book and translations, he welcomed the support of such men as Bab. And the letters chronicle the gradual success of their cause:

. . . Wie froh bin ich, dass Sie schon aus den Andeutungen—denn mehr ist meine Nachdichtung in ihrer beschränkten Form nicht—schon die Grösse dieses Dichters spüren; was wird Ihnen erst das Buch "La multiple Splendeur" sagen, dies schönste Versbuch seit undenklicher Zeit !! Die Dramen Philipp II werden wohl erscheinen, auch die "Morgenröten" die Brandes ein wenig überschätzt¹⁴—vorerst aber die Lyrik in ihrer Gesamtheit. Darüber werde ich Ihnen hoffentlich bald ein Definitives sagen können. . . .¹⁵

27. Aug. 1909

Sehr verehrter lieber Herr Bab, ich habe Ihnen nicht nur meinen Dank zu sagen, sondern auch meine Bewunderung. Denn es ist erstaunlich, wie Sie, der Sie doch das Werk Verhaerens nur im Umriss kennen, das Wesentliche sicher und scharf erfasst haben. Und dann das Tempo, der Ton—jenes Nichtangsthaben vor der Übertreibung, das ich so sehr liebe, weil es das einzig Fruchtbare ist. Wirklich nur

"quand nous nous admirons vraiment les uns les autres
du fond même de notre ardeur et notre foi"¹⁶

¹⁴ Georg Brandes, "Émile Verhaeren als Dramatiker," *Die Schaubühne*, 5 April 1906.

¹⁵ This letter is undated; probably August 1909.

¹⁶ "La Ferveur" (*La multiple Splendeur*). [sic]

nur dann, wenn wir uns Bewunderungen hingeben, könnten wir zu Ausblicken gelangen. Ich schätze seit langem die Art wie Sie—in Gegensatz zu den "Feineren"—Dehmel lieben und bewundern (wiewohl Sie sicher so wie auch ich seiner Mängel bewusst sind) und habe Ihnen oft im Stillen dafür gedankt. Nun sind wir uns wieder begegnet und werden hoffentlich getreu Schulter an Schulter bleiben.

Ich hatte inzwischen die Freude zu hören, dass mein Verhaeren-Buch so ziemlich sicher zuerst in Frankreich erscheint.¹⁷ Die deutsche Grenze zu überbrücken war immer mein Ehrgeiz: einmal aber nicht passiv zu wirken, als Empfangender, sondern als Gebender ist mir wirklich Freude.

...

* * *

27. Februar 1910

Lieber Herr Bab, ist Ihr Bernard Shaw schon erschienen?¹⁸ Ich freue mich so sehr darauf! Auch meine Arbeit nähert sich dem Ende: der Band über Verhaeren und die Gedichte sind schon im Druck: von neuen Gedichten finden Sie eine Probe im Blaubuch von diesmal, dem nächsten "Zeitgeist" und "Sozialistischen Monatsheften." Jetzt wächst auch über die Arbeit das Gefühl der Freude empor: ich war selten so innerlich beruhigt, so rein gestimmt gegenüber einem Werk. Und nun geht es bald an eigene Versuche zurück.

Für Ihr Shaw Buch möchte ich Ihnen eine Adresse in England geben, Mr. Jethro Bithell, der eine ausgezeichnete Anthologie deutscher Lyrik gemacht hat und Ihr Shaw Buch sicher unterstützen wird.¹⁹

P.S. Bei Reinhardt will jetzt Graf Kessler für Verhaeren interveniren.

...

* * *

(postcard: 4 March 1910)

Lieber Herr Bab, ich freue mich sehr auf Ihren Shaw. Mein Verhaeren ist leider sehr im Druck verzögert. Aber ich möchte Sie bitten in einer Angelegenheit vielleicht jetzt schon tätig sein: Graf Kessler und Hofmannsthal suchen Reinhardt zu bestimmen, die "Helena" anlässlich des Gastspiels der Weltausstellung in Brüssel als Uropremière zu spielen. Das bedeutet für Reinhardt einen triumphalen Empfang, denn Verhaeren ist in Belgien was Ibsen und Björnson für Norwegen war. Vielleicht können Sie im Reinhardtkreise dafür [?] Propaganda machen, ich selbst rühre keine Hand, weil ich ein Refus V[erhaeren]s nicht dulde.

* * *

¹⁷ In a letter of 20 December 1909, Zweig mentions that his book will probably sell five times as well in the French translation as in the German.

¹⁸ Julius Bab, *Bernard Shaw*, Berlin, 1910.

¹⁹ Bithell later translated Zweig's *Émile Verhaeren* into English (London 1914) and also *Hélène de Sparte* in *The Plays of Émile Verhaeren*, London, 1916.

(25 March 1910)

Lieber Herr Bab, seien Sie nicht böse, dass ich Ihnen heute noch keine Zeile über Ihren Shaw schreibe. Ich endige die Verhaerenausgabe und arbeite fieberhaft. Heute nur zwei Dinge.

Reinhardt will in Brüssel zuerst die "Helena" spielen mit der Sorma !!!²⁰ Es ist noch nicht ganz sicher, aber Graf Kessler und Hofmannsthal haben es beinahe durchgesetzt. Können Sie irgendwie nachschieben dann tun Sie es bitte. Es wäre in Brüssel ein gigantischer Erfolg.

Und dann: ich habe hier mit einem Verein gesprochen, dem Akademischen Verein für Musik und Litteratur wegen eines Vortrags von Ihnen. Er ist bereit (für nächste Saison) aber er kann nicht viel zahlen, da er keine Entrée nimmt. Würden Sie es mit 100 Mark tun? So viel hoffe ich herauszuschlagen. Aber es wäre doch wichtig für eine Verbindung mit Wien.

...

The performance of Verhaeren's *Le Cloître* (*Das Kloster*) in Berlin on 23 September 1910 is mentioned briefly in several post-cards from Zweig to Bab in September and October without much enlightening comment. This was the performance which Eloesser reviewed unfavorably (cp. supra), and there is also an unfavorable review in *Die schöne Literatur*, 11 Jg., Nr. 22. The critic of *Bühne und Welt* (xiv Jg., p. 82) was more favorably disposed toward the play. *Hélène de Sparte* (*Helenas Heimkehr*) had its German première in Stuttgart on 13 December 1910 and was coolly received by the critics.²¹

In February 1912, Verhaeren came to Hamburg for a public reading:

... Es ist nun ausgemacht, dass Verhaeren am 1. März in Hamburg liest, von anderen Städten können Prag und Wien und München als gesichert gelten, Leipzig und Berlin als wahrscheinlich. ...²²

Verhaeren wrote to his wife of his pleasure at the reception in Hamburg.²³

Zweig's letters from this period reflect a general satisfaction with the progress of his efforts, and both he and Bab continued their lectures and articles on Verhaeren:

²⁰ The famous German actress, Agnes Sorma. No record of this performance appears in the lists of Reinhardt's productions.

²¹ Cp. *Bühne und Welt*, xiv Jg., p. 354; *Das literarische Echo*, 13 Jg., vol. 8, 602.

²² Letter of 24 August 1911.

²³ *A Marthe Verhaeren*, Paris, 1937; letter of 28 February 1912. Cp. also letter of 21 February 1912, supra.

Lieber Herr Bab! Ich habe mich schon gefreut, wie ich blos die Korrektur des Verhaerenaufsatzes in die Hand bekam und um wieviel mehr, als ich jetzt den ersten Blick in die schöne Arbeit tun durfte. Ich will Ihnen noch ausführlicher dafür danken, als ich es jetzt in aller Eile kann—ich lebe am Land und komme nur immer auf ein paar Stunden in der Woche herein—und grüsse Sie nur heute viele Male und herzlichst. Die Sache Verhaerens hat übrigens gerade heute noch die letzte und schon von mir lange herbeigesehnte Krönung erhalten: die unausbleibliche Beschimpfung von Max Nordau, dem es gelungen ist, in Verhaeren einen Erotoman zu entdecken.²⁴ Eine Entdeckung übrigens, die ich in Frankreich publizieren will, wo sie nicht wenig Heiterkeit erregen wird. . . .²⁵

But Zweig held a more positive feeling of their success than this unfavorable attitude of a critic, and wrote to Bab shortly thereafter, on 22 June 1912:

Ich muss Ihnen noch, Lieber Herr Bab, nochmals für Ihren Verhaerenartikel danken,²⁶ der mir bei dem zweiten ruhigeren Lesen noch doppelt gut gefallen hat, eben weil er durch seine kluge Einschränkung und Begrenzung zeigt, dass unsere Bewegung nicht ein eiliger, blinder Rummel ist, sondern eine trotz aller ästhetischen Wachsamkeit frohe und sichere Erkenntnis. Ich weiss selbst, dass mein Buch vielfach die inneren Einwände unterschlagen hat, die ich selber hatte und habe, aber ich glaube, es ist notwendig, in einem anderen Ton von jemandem zu sprechen, solange er noch ganz unbekannt ist und den Widerstand des Misstrauens gegen sich hat, wie heute, da für Verhaeren so viel Bewunderung in Deutschland lebendig ist, dass eine Kritik ihm eher förderlich als hinderlich sein kann. Vergessen Sie nicht ein Exemplar des Essays sobald er erscheint nach Caillou qui Bique (Belgien) zu schicken. Sie senden Verhaeren damit sicher eine grosse Freude ins Haus. . . .

The war put a sudden end to Zweig's visit to Belgium in 1914,²⁷ and thereafter he heard from Verhaeren only through intermediaries until Verhaeren's sudden death in November 1916. Of this Zweig wrote Bab on 2 January 1917:

. . . Sie mögen denken wie schwer mir dieser Verlust gewesen ist; noch vor kurzem erhielt ich zum ersten Mal im Kriege von Verhaeren durch einen Schweizer Uebermittler schriftlichen Gruss und Bekennung seiner ungebrochenen Freundschaft.²⁸ Ich selbst habe, wie Sie bemerkt haben

²⁴ Nordau's review of *Hélène de Sparte*, *Neue Freie Presse*, Wien, 11 June 1912.

²⁵ Letter of 11 June 1912.

²⁶ The article appears in *Neue Rundschau*, 23 Jg., 1912, II, 10-20.

²⁷ Cp. *Erinnerungen an Émile Verhaeren*, 84 ff.

²⁸ Charles Baudoin, *Psychoanalysis and Aesthetics*, New York 1924,

werden, auch bei seinem Tode geschwiegen, wie bei allen anderen Anlässen: ich spreche nicht, solange ich nicht frei sprechen kann. . . .

Later, however, from Zürich on 20 February 1918, Zweig wrote:

. . . Ein kleines Buch von mir "Erinnerungen an Verhaeren" habe ich in 100 Exemplaren für meine Freunde in Wien drucken lassen. Es ist nicht für den Handel bestimmt nur für die nächsten Menschen und selbstverständlich Ihnen ein Exemplar zugebracht.

The collection of letters ends with a rather sad final comment on 17 May 1924:

. . . In Frankreich kümmert sich niemand mehr um Verhaeren und vielleicht wird er noch einmal von Deutschland in seiner Weltstellung gezeigt werden, ganz wie damals. . . .

* * *

These are the most important records of the Zweig-Verhaeren relationship in the correspondence. But, as a conclusion, mention should be made of an excellent camera portrait of Verhaeren seated in his garden taken by Zweig and mailed as a postcard on 8 September 1910.

WILLIAM F. OECHLER

Harvard University

THE FIFTH COMMANDMENT; SOME ALLUSIONS TO SIR ROBERT FILMER'S WRITINGS IN *TRISTRAM SHANDY*

Although Walter Shandy's "systems and opiniatry" seem peculiarly his own, they are based upon ideas hotly disputed in the 17th century and remembered well into the latter half of the 18th century. If Mr. Shandy forced every "event in nature into an hypothesis, by which means never man crucified TRUTH at the rate he did,"¹ yet he built his hypotheses and crucified truth after the examples of such theorists as Sir Robert Filmer. Mr. Shandy's ideas may appear singular, but they are no more singular than the

writes that he, in 1916, conveyed to Zweig Verhaeren's fervent admiration. He may have been the intermediary referred to here.

¹ *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*, ed. J. A. Work, New York, 1940, Bk. 9, Ch. 32.

principles of the absolute monarchists from which they are derived. An examination of Filmer's writings together with Locke's two treatises *Of Government*,² in which much of Filmer's theorizing was preserved,³ will make clearer some of the dialogue in certain episodes in *Tristram Shandy* and reveal elements in the novel hitherto insufficiently noticed.

In the first chapters of *Tristram Shandy*, indeed, Walter Shandy is described as a Filmerian. Provoked into speculation by the question of Mrs. Shandy's lying-in, he launched into a disquisition concerning civil right and the balance of power in the "monarchical system of domestic government established in the first creation of things by God."⁴

² *Two Treatises of Government*, 1690.

³ Locke's work tended to keep Filmer's ideas before the public eye. By 1760 there were found few to espouse the theory of the Divine Right of Kings. After nearly half a century of mixed monarchy under the first two Georges rationalizations of the Stuart regime were no longer tenable, and those who had accepted Filmer and the patriarchal theory of monarchy eagerly were anxious to forget both the theorist and his theory. But their opponents would not allow them completely to forget Filmer's *Patriarcha*. For Filmer's outmoded system was found to be useful as a means of ridicule and Filmer's name became a convenient label with which to deride a political opponent. Filmer's name, then, continued to live, as the political caricature of the sixties shows. See the *Catalogue of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, Division I (Personal and Political Satires), Vol. 3, pt. 2, no. 3584, dated 1757; Vol. 4, nos. 4151, dated 1766; 4238, dated 1768; 4457, dated 1770. No. 4238 is in part explained by a reference to "an advertisement in 'The Gentleman's Magazine,' 1764, p. 638," from which the following is quoted: "*List of Scotch books in the Press at Edinburgh, and speedily will be published (by subscription) on a fine paper and beautiful type (price one guinea) a new Edition of Sir Richard Filmer's book on Patriarchy, or, Treatise on Government; proving the jus divinum, passive obedience, and non-resistance; with annotations and illustrations. By Sir BULLFACE DOUBLEFEE, knt.*" Why Filmer is given the name "Richard" instead of "Robert" is not explained.

⁴ Bk. I, Ch. 18. Cf. Filmer, *Directions for Obedience to Governours in Dangerous or Doubtful Times*, which was bound with the *Observations upon Aristotle's Politiques touching Forms of Government*, 1652. In this pamphlet Filmer remarks "Originally the Supreme Power was in the Fatherhood; and the first Kings were Fathers of Families" (p. 153); "... in the Infancy of the World, the Paternal Government was Monarchical . . ." (p. 154); "The Right of Fatherly Government was ordained by God . . ." (p. 156). The page nos. and the quotations are from the edition of 1680, in which this pamphlet was bound with *The Freeholders Grand Inquest*, etc.

In this point [says Tristram, Walter Shandy] was entirely of Sir Robert Filmer's opinion, That the plans and institutions of the greatest monarchies in the eastern parts of the world, were, originally, all stolen from that admirable pattern and prototype of this household and paternal power;—which, for a century, he said, or more, had gradually been degenerating away into a mix'd government;—the form of which, however desirable in great combinations of the species,—was very troublesome in small ones,—and seldom produced anything, that he saw, but sorrow and confusion.⁵

In Book 5, published December, 1761, some two years after Book 1, Walter Shandy is again depicted as a disciple of Filmer, although Filmer's name is not specifically mentioned. Walter Shandy's summary of the first thirty pages of the *Tristra-paedia* clearly suggests Filmer's theories, despite the elder Shandy's learned references to Hesiod and Politian, whom he gives by way of authorities.

These thirty pages, we are told, make up an "introductory preface" or a "prefatory introduction" upon "political or civil government." That this introduction is not "closely connected" with the subject-matter of the *Tristra-paedia* Walter Shandy saw, and maintained that he was "insensibly led into it" from his reflection that the "foundation" of "political or civil government" was laid in the "first conjunction betwixt male and female, for the procreation of the species. . . ."⁶

The original of society, continued my father, I'm satisfied is, what *Politian* tells us, i. e. merely conjugal; and nothing more than the getting together of one man and one woman;—to which (according to *Hesiod*) the philosopher adds a servant;—but supposing in the beginning there were no men servants born—he lays the foundation of it, in a man,—a woman—and a bull.—I believe 'tis an ox, quoth Yorick . . .⁷

This passage, touching as it does upon the patriarchal theory of society, suggests Filmer's writings, and could easily have recalled to the contemporary reader of *Tristram Shandy* the fact that

⁵ *Loc. cit.* Cf. Filmer's remarks concerning Aristotle's assertion "that such were the antient Eastern Monarchies," i. e., absolute monarchies, in *Observations Concerning the Original of Government*, p. 257 of the edn. of 1679, which was bound with *The Freeholders Grand Inquest*. See also note (4) above.

⁶ Bk. 5, Ch. 31.

⁷ *Loc. cit.* Cf. Filmer *Patriarcha, or the Natural Power of Kings*, 1680, pp. 35 and 37. See also the preface to his *Observations upon Aristotle's Politiques*, 1679.

Walter Shandy had been first introduced as a Filmerian.⁸ Yet there does remain the possibility that Sterne at this point was ridiculing not a specific writer, but the older political theorists in general. That it was of Filmer's theories of monarchy that Sterne was thinking, however, the sequel shows conclusively.

In this sequel Filmer's interpretation of the Fifth Commandment plays an important part. Corporal Trim, it will be remembered, looked upon the injunction "Honour thy father and thy mother" as enjoining a simple duty of gratitude. But in the patriarchal theory of monarchy the Fifth Commandment had been given a political meaning, for, according to Filmer, this commandment especially confirmed the jurisdictional power, considered by Filmer to be the "Fountain of Regal Authority, by Ordination of God himself," inherent in the parent over his child.⁹ Filmer declared in the *Patriarcha* that "we find in the *Decalogue*, That the Law which enjoyns Obedience to Kings, is delivered in the terms of *Honour thy Father*, as if all power were originally in the Father."¹⁰ Again, in "The Anarchy of a Limited or Mixed Monarchy," he said:

Whereas many confess that Government only in the *abstract* is the ordinance of God, they are not able to prove any such in the Scripture, but only in the fatherly power, and therefore we find the Commandment that enjoyns obedience to superiours, given in the terms *Honour thy Father*: so that not only the *Power and right of Government*, but the *form of the power of governing*, and the *person having that power*, are all the ordinance of God: the first Father had not only simply power, but power Monarchical, as he was a Father, immediately from God.¹¹

This commandment, however, seemingly refers to father and mother as equal in status; and Filmer had to show that the woman is inferior to the man. He did so by arguing that "God at the

⁸ See note (5) above, also note (3) above.

⁹ See Ned Ward, *The Whigs Unmasked, being the Secret History of the Calf's-Head Club*, London, 1713, p. 175, where a "Modern Whig" is satirised as follows:

"Ask him his religion, and his Answer is, it is older than the Ten Commandments; but . . . he cannot make up the Number for the Soul of him, since the fifth must needs slip him, because it enjoins Obedience to his Superiours."

¹⁰ P. 23. Cited in Locke, *op. cit.*, Bk. 1, sect. 60.

¹¹ *Observations Concerning the Original of Government*, p. 254. Also cited in Locke, *loc. cit.*, note (10) above.

Creation gave the Sovereignty to the Man over the Woman, as being the Nobler and Principal Agent in Generation."¹²

Before Trim's recital of the Fifth Commandment had put an end to Walter Shandy's digression on the "original" of government, Mr. Shandy had been led on to discuss the "natural relation between a father and his child" and to enumerate the ways in which a father secures "the right and jurisdiction" over his children, that is to say, "by marriage . . . by adoption . . . by legitimation . . . and by procreation."¹³ He was interrupted in this enumeration by Yorick, who said "I lay a slight stress upon one of them . . . the act, especially when it ends there, lays as little obligation upon the child, as it conveys power to the father." Mr. Shandy declared Yorick to be wrong "for this plain reason * * *" Now if Mr. Shandy had been following Filmer's argument that "by right of fatherhood, the Form of monarchy must be preferred above all" others,¹⁴ then the next step for him to take, since he had argued that men are born under the jurisdiction of their parents, was to show that the female is not equal in status to the male. And this step Walter Shandy took, when he added "that the offspring is not so under the power and jurisdiction of the mother." Of this qualification Yorick observed, with Locke on his side,¹⁵ that whatever is true of the father's natural jurisdiction over the child "holds equally" true of the mother's. This opinion Mr. Shandy denied, citing Filmer's assertion that the father, but not the mother, has jurisdiction over the child, because the "man is the Nobler and Principal Agent in Generation":¹⁶ "She is under authority herself . . . and . . . besides . . . she is not the principal agent." Mr. Shandy admitted that the "son ought to pay" the mother "respect," but implied that such respect is a matter of courtesy only, and cited Justinian to buttress his opinion that the mother has no real jurisdiction over the son.¹⁷

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 172.

¹³ Bk. 5, Ch. 31.

¹⁴ Filmer, *op. cit.*, p. 246.

¹⁵ *Cf.* Locke, *op. cit.*, Bk. 1, section 55: ". . . the mother cannot be denied an equal share in begetting of the child, and so the absolute authority of the father will not arise from hence."

¹⁶ See note 12 above.

¹⁷ The *Institutes*, I. 11. 10 reads "Women cannot adopt, because even their natural children are not in their power. . . ."

At this point in the narrative one of uncle Toby's droll interruptions focussed attention upon the Fifth Commandment. When Yorick remarked that he could learn of the respect owed by a son to his mother just as well from the Catechism as from Justinian, uncle Toby, as will be remembered, volunteered the information that Trim could "repeat every word" of the Catechism by heart.¹⁸ Yorick called upon Trim to recite the Fifth Comamndment, and Trim, with the aid of uncle Toby's military prompting, "went through his manual with exactness" until he had, as Sterne expressly records, "*honoured his father and mother.*"¹⁹ The interruption was not to Walter Shandy's liking, for Trim's recitation of the Fifth Commandment threatened, when introduced in this abrupt way, to embarrass the delicate point the elder Shandy was making about the unequal jurisdiction of parents. He was not utterly disconcerted, however, for as he told Yorick he saw matter for instruction as well as for jest in Trim's performance. Trim's mechanical recitation he pointed out as the "*scaffold work* of INSTRUCTION, its true point of folly, without the BUILDING behind it." But though he thus called attention to the nature of Trim's responses, he was chiefly concerned to ridicule the catechist—and so by implication Yorick, with whom he was arguing—rather than the catechised in the remarks the incident occasioned. Let pedagogues, he told Yorick pointedly, see themselves in this recital of Trim's, where, he was prepared to wager, words had no "determinate idea annexed" to them. Rote learning, he added, is a "husk and shell" which grows up around the unskilfull instructor and prevents him from achieving wisdom. Thus he linked together Yorick's interpretation of the Fifth Commandment with Trim's mechanical recitation of it. So far in his skirmish of opinions with Yorick Mr. Shandy had come off with flying colours, so that even Yorick was forced to say that he thought him "inspired." He had made his point about the *necessity* for interpretation; we may guess how he would have answered Locke's assertion that Filmer and others like him lopped scripture to make it fit the "size of their notions,"²⁰ though just how he would have defended his own and Filmer's reading of the Fifth Commandment we are not told, for Trim, when asked what had been meant by "honouring thy father

¹⁸ Bk. 5, Ch. 32.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* Sterne's italics.

²⁰ Locke, *op. cit.*, Bk. 1, secs. 60.

and mother," replied, to Yorick's satisfaction and to Mr. Shandy's confounding: "Allowing them, an' please your honour, three half-pence a day out of my pay, when they grew old." The whole episode, including the military pantomime of Toby and Trim, raises the question of authority and obedience to authority—a question warmly disputed by the absolute monarchists and dealt with at length by Locke.

WILFRED WATSON

Toronto, Canada

BROWNING AND SWINBURNE: AN EPISODE

"Somehow or another Swinburne slipped through the meshes of the Chapman net."¹ The following letter from Browning to Richard Monckton Milnes, published here for the first time,² throws light upon Edward Chapman's reluctance to cast his net for so electric a fish as the young Swinburne. It also reveals Browning's part in the proceedings which made it difficult for Swinburne to obtain a reputable publisher, and it emphasizes the essential distaste Browning felt for Swinburne's somewhat pagan approach to poetry.

19, Warwick Crescent
Upper Westbourne Terrace, W.
July 7, '63.

My dear Milnes,

I should like to put down in words what I said last night when considerably surprised and a little annoyed: you will see how mere talk gets turned aside from its purpose; and for reasons, I am somewhat susceptible on this point.

I know next to nothing of Swinburne, and like him much: I have received courtesy from him, and been told he feels kindly to me—I believe it, indeed. Of his works, since his first volume, I know not a line, except a poem which I looked over a long while ago at Rossetti's, and the pieces he recited the other night: I could only have an opinion, therefore, on these. I thought them moral mistakes, redeemed by much intellectual ability. They may be

¹ Arthur Waugh, *A Hundred Years of Publishing: Being the Story of Chapman and Hall, Ltd.*, London, 1930, p. 79.

² I am indebted to the present Lord Crewe, son of the first Lord Houghton (R. M. Milnes), for permission to print this letter. I have not seen the original but am using what appears to be an accurate transcription provided by Lord Crewe's secretary. The year date may be wrong.

a sample of the forthcoming book,—or just the exceptional instances—I hope so.

When I was abruptly appealed to, some days after, for my estimate of Mr. Swinburne's powers,—I don't know what I could do but say "that he had genius, and wrote verses in which to my mind there was no good at all."

If I referred,—as I probably did,—to a similarity of opinion on the part of others present, it was from the reluctance I had to stand forward and throw even this cherry-stone at a young poet.

How I came by this reluctance, and keep it increasingly in spite of age ("which loses all sense of the good and the beautiful, the this and the that")—God knows! I have for thirty years my own utter unintelligibility taught with such public and private zest that I might be excused for fancying every young man's knuckles wanted 'dusting'—but I don't fancy it. Unluckily the truth is the truth, and one must speak it now and then. It was a shame in this case for Chapman to quote my blame of two or three little pieces—given on a demand for unqualified praise which was impossible—as the reason for rejecting a whole bookful of what may be real poetry, for aught I am aware: but as I am in the habit of being as truthful as I like about the quality of certain things which he patronizes, and as I never saw their titles disappear from his advertisements in consequence—I conclude that he only uses my witnessing when he wants to cover his own conviction.

I am, my dear Milnes,
Your ever faithfully
ROBERT BROWNING.

In 1860, Swinburne had published his first volume, *The Queen Mother and Rosamund*, definitely predictive of the works seething in his mind. For these works, many of which he had begun to compose, he would need a publisher, the more respectable the better. The ways to a publisher of poetry were devious: usually by way of a friend who had an influential friend who was on intimate footing with a publisher. So it was that Lady Trevelyan is said to have commended Swinburne to the influential R. M. Milnes, who was intimate with numerous publishers. "On the 5th of May 1860, in reply to a formal summons, Swinburne called at Milnes' town house," where, says Sir Edmund Gosse, "the two were soon on terms of high facetious familiarity, and during the next two years, in particular, Milnes was infinitely serviceable to the young friend who so much amused him."³ Milnes, incidentally, was fifty years of age, Swinburne twenty-four.

The young poet had samples of his work to show. It was Milnes'

³ *Life of A. C. Swinburne*, London, 1917, p. 75.

task to provide the right audience, a wholly congenial task for the man whose home had become famous for its gatherings of every sort of distinguished person. Sir Edmund Gosse provides a circumstantial account of one such occasion, perhaps the first, during which Swinburne displayed his startling wares:

In the summer of 1862, a distinguished party assembled at Fryston; it included Venables, James Spedding, the newly appointed Archbishop of York (William Thomson), and Thackeray, the latter having brought his two daughters. . . . On Sunday evening, after dinner, he [Swinburne] was asked to read some of his poems. His choice was injudicious; he is believed to have recited 'The Leper'; it is certain that he read 'Les Noyades.' At this the Archbishop of York made so shocked a face that Thackeray smiled and whispered to Lord Houghton, while the two young ladies, who had never heard such sentiments expressed before, giggled aloud in their excitement. Their laughter offended the poet, who, however, was soothed by Lady Houghton's tactfully saying, 'Well, Mr. Swinburne, if you *will* read such extraordinary things, you must expect us to laugh.' 'Les Noyades' was then proceeding on its amazing course, and the Archbishop was looking more and more horrified, when suddenly the butler—'like an avenging angel,' as Lady Ritchie says—threw open the door and announced, 'Prayers! my Lord!'⁴

Gosse, it will be noted, does not mention Browning as one of the guests on this memorable evening, and Browning's letter to Milnes, quoted above, was apparently written approximately a year after this occasion, which is assigned to the summer of 1862. Yet Browning's letter may have been written a year earlier and the date have been transcribed wrongly.⁵ On the other hand, it is legitimate and necessary to suppose that Browning was present at Fryston on an occasion very similar to that described by Gosse. The whole circumstances of such a display on Swinburne's part would appeal to Browning as an extreme breach of good taste. Furthermore, the manner of Swinburne's poetry was doubtless as objectionable to Browning as the matter. He was later to tell Miss Blagden that Swinburne's verses "are 'florid impotence,' to my taste—the *minimum* of thought and idea in the *maximum* of words and phraseology."⁶

So much for Browning's private opinion of Swinburne. It is with the effect of this opinion on Milnes' plan of finding a publisher for Swinburne's poems that we may now be concerned. If Brown-

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 95-96.

⁵ See note 2, above.

⁶ *Letters of Robert Browning*, ed. T. L. Hood, New York, 1933, p. 136.

ing was to have any influence, it would have to be with his own publisher, Edward Chapman of Chapman and Hall, Ltd. Besides the Brownings, Chapman and Hall had on their highly respectable list the names of Dickens, Thackeray, Lever, Carlyle, Clough, Allingham, and others. A young poet could well have profited by such company. As one pieces the story together, it is apparent that Chapman was interested enough in Swinburne to ask for opinions concerning his verses. Some few days after a Swinburne evening at Fryston, Chapman confronted Browning with a request for a frank opinion. "Unluckily the truth is the truth, and one must speak it now and then"; so Browning spoke his disapprobation, then added his awareness of "a similarity of opinion on the part of others present." Perhaps Browning regretted this appeal for support, but one can see that his was the altogether human means of partial escape from an embarrassing situation.

The next step seems to have been taken by Milnes, who may have approached Chapman with the direct proposal that he publish Swinburne. If such a proposal were made, Chapman doubtless replied that his firm had to depend upon professional opinion upon which to base decisions on the publishable qualities of poetry and that the best available opinion, that of Robert Browning, stood flatly against the advisability of taking such a chance.

The penultimate step occurred on the night of July 6. Browning was again at Fryston. The recent performance of Swinburne apparently became the subject of conversation. Suddenly someone, perhaps Milnes himself, said that Chapman had refused to publish Swinburne, largely because "You, Mr. Browning, disapproved his verses." Considerably surprised and a little annoyed, Browning evidently offered a heated denial of fault and a circumstantial account of his talk with Chapman. One understands perfectly the annoyance: no matter what was said in extenuation, the impression would remain that an older poet, through jealousy, intolerance, or perversity, had placed an obstacle in the way of a young poet.

The final step, therefore, is the letter of July 7, in which Browning makes clear to Milnes and to his own conscience that he had had no intention of harming Swinburne and that Chapman was influenced simply because he wanted an excuse to refuse the job of publishing Swinburne's highly dubious poetry. One detects the irony in Browning's bitter blaming of Chapman, for Chapman needed and used Browning's opinion to strengthen his own conviction just as

Browning had needed and used the opinion of others to strengthen his conviction!

As for Swinburne, he eventually secured Edward Moxon as publisher of *Poems and Ballads*, but lost him under the threat of belligerently adverse criticism. The quest for a publisher ended when the dubious but daring John Camden Hotten consented to substitute for Moxon.

KENNETH L. KNICKERBOCKER

University of Tennessee

GEORGE MOORE AND EDOUARD DUJARDIN

"To none have I given so ardent an ear as I have to Edouard Dujardin. I have harvested most profitably in Dujardin's work."¹ Aside from Dujardin's role as a link between Moore and the French Symbolism together with its concomitant Wagnerism,² and the Dujardin influences on the Moore style and method in the semi-fiction, all of which have received ample notice and scrutiny, no attention has been called to the immediate formative influence of Dujardin from which stem the biblical and religious novels of Moore.³ The indebtedness is acknowledged in the voluminous autobiographic writings and is specifically illustrated in *The Lake* and *The Brook Kerith*.⁴

Moore confessed to long theological discussions with Dujardin: "I had written to Dujardin, who is always looking forward to seeing me in an apartment in Paris where we could continue our

¹ Moore, *Conversations in Ebury Street*, p. 176. All references are to the *Carra Edition* (New York, 1922-24).

² Dujardin edited for a time in Paris the *Revue Wagnérienne*. Moore's heroine, significantly, in *Evelyn Innes* is a Wagnerian soprano. See John Freeman, *A Portrait of George Moore in a Study of His Work* (New York, 1922).

³ Joseph Hone (*The Life of George Moore*, New York, 1936) makes no important mention of the Dujardin impulse discernible in the late religious novels; Helmut Bock ("George Moore: *The Brook Kerith*, Eine Kritische Studie," *Die Neueren Sprachen*, xxxix, 1931, 340-355.) fails to relate the Dujardin affiliation as the genesis of the novel.

⁴ The beginnings are seen in *Evelyn Innes* and *Sister Teresa* which Moore wrote under the influence of Huysmans.

theological discussions til one in the morning."⁵ From Dujardin Moore became aware of the Old Testament prophets, of Daniel, and the Jewish sects. Dujardin was always the great teacher, always ready to instruct the interested with great cheer and patience.⁶ It is significant that Moore, reminiscing in *Conversations in Ebury Street*, recalls to mind Dujardin first as the biblical critic:

... my thoughts turned to Dujardin, who had gone to the south of France to write a long-meditated work, no doubt the work in which Jesus is shown to be an old Palestinian deity worshipped in secret, in caves, whence he began to emerge on the decline of Judaism, Judaism having about that time lost all spiritual significance. Dujardin, I said, will be able to tell me why my article failed on his return from the south, where I could see him in my thoughts writing feverishly, the windows wide open, the curtains filled with sweet, Mediterranean breezes, working all day long, ten, twelve, fourteen hours a day, condensing a whole year's work into two months.⁷

And in the same reminiscence Moore testifies to the awakening power of Dujardin:

Now, whosoever writes much, repeats, and if I am guilty I apologise to all and sundry and hasten to add a new thing not hitherto told: that

⁵ *Salve*, p. 320. Moore describes one of these theological discussions in *Conversations in Ebury Street*, pp. 219-20.

⁶ Moore cherishes the memory of Dujardin the teacher:

If a disciple in search of knowledge were to come to him at three o'clock in the morning and stand by his bedside and say: Dujardin, I am in doubt why Brünnhilde, who is but an emanation of Wotan's will, should be condemned by Wotan to sleep til a pure hero comes through the fire and releases her from it, Dujardin would rise from his bed, rub his eyes, and recalling the philosophy of Wagner by his motives, which I believe he never ceases to chant even in his dreams, would begin by telling his visitor that the point had often been under discussion in the *Revue Wagnérienne*. He would not, however, tell the intruder to read the back numbers but show much patience with him, inviting him to sit on the edge of the bed whilst he explained the metaphysics of the music. (*Conversations in Ebury Street*, p. 217.)

⁷ P. 209. Moore's thoughts turn to Dujardin in the light of the disappointment occasioned by the reception of a Moore article which appeared in *The Sunday Times*, the avowed content of which was critical. It is not strange that Moore, recalling critical failure, should feel that Dujardin might tell him why the failure occurred. It is a testimony of Moore's opinion of Dujardin.

during the thirty-odd years of intimacy, the sequence of the aforesaid meeting, I have learnt his mind from end to end, and my knowledge being like God's knowledge—as complete and as perfect—it has always seemed to me a disgrace that I never took him as a subject for literature, for as such he is beyond compare, an abridgement of Shakespeare; and a compendium of Balzac, more Balzac than Shakespeare; an undeveloped initiative of all the richness of the *Comedy*. I see him in nearly all the stories, the scenes of provincial life excepted, and if I have refrained it was from lack of talent to find an embracing line which would include all without loss or surplus. God knows, my thoughts have sought the fable day after day as we walk through the melancholy alleys of Fontainebleau or smoke cigars in the evening when his lady has gone to bed and he breaks forth like a bird into song. *It is then, whilst listening to his tale of old Palestinian deities, that I think of him as a rocky hill and myself as a sculptor who sees in the hill multitudinous art that he will never attain, his means being insufficient.*⁸

It was Dujardin the student of the Bible who turned to Moore's attention the artistic possibilities of biblical subjects. For Dujardin himself was never able to find “. . . a sufficiency of form for his dreams, whether they were poetic, philosophic, or religious,”⁹ as did Moore in *The Lake* and *The Brook Kerith*. *The Lake* is dedicated to Dujardin to compensate for Moore's appropriation of Dujardin's *La Source du Fleuve Chrétien* as the title of a book written by Ralph Ellis, one of the characters of the novel.

In the novel *The Lake* Moore fashioned the character of Ralph Ellis after Dujardin. In the last analysis, the book is the expression of the artist's own dissatisfaction with Catholicism and an Ireland which was proving uncongenial to his temperament and unreceptive of his efforts. *The Lake* is the story of Father Oliver Gogarth's tragic realization of his lack of vocation and of his illicit love for Rose Leicester, a love which he disguises as the profound and respectful interest of a priest in a wayward woman whom he had helped to banish from the parish. Together with the searing struggle to dissemble carnality and the futility of the passion is strengthened Gogarth's inward revolt against the unrelieved tedium of the parish life. At the very beginning Gogarth is found wishing himself “. . . away in a foreign country distracted every moment by new things, learning the language out of a volume of songs, and hearing music, any music, French or German—any

⁸ P. 210. The italics are mine.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 215.

music but Irish music."¹⁰ We need only compare this yearning with the complaint made by Moore to Dujardin in a letter dated 24 September, 1902, to see that this sentiment was a personal one: "I should like to do something different—paint, model, write in French, anything to escape. For the moment I have had enough of the Gaelic League and of Ireland."¹¹

In London Rose has become the secretary of Ralph Ellis, the Dujardin of the novel. Like Dujardin, Ellis originally had been a poet, but had turned to biblical criticism when he realized his mediocrity as a poet.¹² But the poet in Ellis acts as an "agent in advance to the man of learning."¹³ Primarily, Ellis is concerned with poetizing certain of the minor prophets—Hosea, Amos, Daniel, Jeremiah. And this, precisely, is the concern of Dujardin in *La Source du Fleuve Chrétien*.¹⁴ In answer to one of Gogarth's pleading letters to return, Rose writes, "We are not theologians here; we are historians, and Mr. Ellis says the Bible is not only a book of revelation, it is also a history and it has a history. And it is the history of the Bible that interests us."¹⁵ This is the very point that Dujardin emphasizes in *La Source du Fleuve Chrétien*.¹⁶ Dujardin does not pretend to attack or defend religion; his avowed aim is simply to trace the Christian Religion back of its ultimate origins, without dwelling upon the truth or untruth of the Divinity.¹⁷ In the novel, Rose refers to Ellis's interest in the recent discovery of certain papyri which take the source of the Christian river farther back than Palestine—far back into central Asia. Dujardin, in his history, points out that the discovery of the papyri of Elephantine shows that the Jews of Elephantine knew

¹⁰ P. 6.

¹¹ *Letters from George Moore to Edouard Dujardin, 1886-1922*. (New York 1929), p. 44.

¹² "It will never be clear to me whether it was Kant or Nietzsche or Palestinian folk-lore that interrupted the successful administration of *Fin de Siècle* and *Jean qui Rit*, or whether the attractions that these newspapers once presented, had become stale. All things have their season, newspapers, religions, and ourselves, and Dujardin having outlived his music, his journalism, his betting, his poetry and play-writing, could not do else than turn into biblical criticism." (*Conversations in Ebury Street*, p. 215.)

¹³ *The Lake*, p. 121.

¹⁴ Pp. i-xv.

¹⁵ *The Lake*, p. 134.

¹⁶ Pp. xv-xxv.

¹⁷ See Helmut Bock, *op. cit.*, pp. 348-353.

nothing of Mosaic law in the middle of the fifth century.¹⁸ And furthermore, Ellis's enthusiastic discussions of Wagner's music and life identify him with the editor of the *Revue Wagnérienne*. Gogarth's irresolvable dilemma, like Dujardin's indecision, must result in complete disjunction. "There is a lake in every man's heart . . . and every man must ungird his loins for the crossing."¹⁹

Dujardin furnished the raw material for *The Brook Kerith*. Not only had Dujardin turned Moore's attention to the fascination of biblical study, but also, in the pages of *La Source du Fleuve Chrétien* and in the long disputations the two had shared, he pointed the way Moore's Jesus was to take.²⁰ Moore's Jesus is understood in the light and shadow of the Jesus of *La Source du Fleuve Chrétien*. Dujardin traces the origin of Christianity back to what he calls "the humble composition of a series of fabulous and dogmatic narratives, written in the shadow of a poor temple in western Syria"²¹ by several generations of fanatical priests for the instruction of a small nation that the disdainful Persians allowed them to govern. The Books of Moses were born of the imperious need felt by a little people of Jerusalem to create a past for itself, to give itself a legislation of divine origin, to legitimize its institutions, to consecrate its nationalistic ambitions, and to sanctify its hatred of outsiders or *goim*. In the face of the invading Hellenism which threatened to disrupt Jewish character, such prophets as Hosea, Amos, and Jeremiah arose. The powerful need was the exhortation of the contemporaries to faith in Jewish nationalism, symbolized by the name of Jahvah.

Among the new prophets who arose claiming to be precursors of the Messiah were John the Baptist and Jesus, whose authenticity Dujardin questions since "our authorities are the epistles of St. Paul,"²² the gospel legends, and a few lines in pagan writers of the

¹⁸ P. xv.

¹⁹ *The Lake*, p. 309.

²⁰ Although *Le Dieu Mort et Ressuscité* appeared too late to afford immediate influence to Moore, still Dujardin must have passed most of its contents to Moore in long disputations.

²¹ *La Source du Fleuve Chrétien*, p. 89.

²² It is St. Paul who perpetuates the transgression of Jesus in *The Brook Kerith*, and it is St. Paul who, when presented with Moore's fifty-two year old Jesus among the Essenes, brands him a madman and rushes out to preach the resurrection of the son of God.

second century." ²³ But Dujardin does not wish to explain away Jesus; Jesus was very necessary. "Then through the Empire the news suddenly spread that the day of deliverance was at hand. . . . This novelty was taught by a Jew of Tarsus, in Syria, tent-maker by trade, Shaoul or Saul and afterwards Paul, by name." ²⁴

In *The Brook Kerith* Moore views Jesus, out of divine setting, historically as a man who arose to meet a need, one of Dujardin's prophets of rare talent, but not the son of God. It was the last sentence of Dujardin's book which moved Moore to show that the story of the death and resurrection of a divine Jesus was the fabrication of St. Paul, who anticipated Voltaire's "même s'il n'y avait pas un Dieu, il faudrait en créer un."

Moore assimilates Dujardin's scepticism and his Jesus appears as an Essene and an eschatologist who does not die on the cross. Joseph of Arimathea secures permission from Pilate to remove the body of Jesus from the cross, and while arranging the body for burial, discovers that Jesus still lives. He restores Jesus to health, and Jesus, "startled at the thoughts that had been put into his mind, asking himself if any man had dared to ask himself if God were not indeed the last uncleanness of the mind," ²⁵ wearily goes back to the Essenes at the Brook Kerith. Years later Jesus, now a shepherd among the Essenes, hears the story of the Lord Jesus Christ from Paul who has, in his dissemination of the salvation attendant to all in the Lord Jesus Christ, wandered to the Essenes. Jesus is determined to expose Paul for "Paul is the enemy of Judaism and I am become the testimony." ²⁶ Jesus does encounter Paul and tries to show him that what he has preached is not true and that what he has suffered, he has suffered in vain. But Paul "did not doubt that he was speaking to a madman whose name, no doubt, was Jesus, and who had come from Nazareth and having got some inkling of the true story of the resurrection had little by little conceived himself to be he who had died that all might be saved." ²⁷

Like Dujardin, Moore takes care not to refute religion but rather to show Jesus as a product of what Taine would call "race, milieu, moment," one whose exalted personality answered the dire need of an entire people and one who was made into a God by men who

²³ *La Source du Fleuve Chrétien*, p. 262.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 296.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 454.

²⁶ *The Brook Kerith*, p. 276.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 473.

never knew him. Moore follows Dujardin in stripping Jesus of divinity and in presenting Him as an historical phenomenon misinterpreted "by a Jew of Tarsus, in Syria, a tentmaker by trade."²⁸ The Jesus of *The Brook Kerith*, for Moore, is an individual whose greatness lies in the fact that he has realized the error of his ways and has seen that true religion is a matter of the heart, of true virtue, rather than an affair of practice, dogma, theology, wrangling and violence.

"For many years, Paul, there were no thoughts in mind, or they were kept back, for I was without a belief; but thought returned to my desolate mind as the spring returns to these hills; and the next step in my advancement was when I began to understand that we may not think of God as a man who would punish men for doing things they have never promised not to do, or recompense them for abstinence from things they never promised to abstain from. Soon after I began to comprehend that the beliefs of our forefathers must be abandoned, and that if we would arrive at any reasonable conception of God, we must not put a stint upon him. . . . All things are God, Paul: thou art God and I am God, but if I were to say thou art man and I am God, I should be the madman that thou believest me to be. . . . There is but one thing, Paul, to learn to live for ourselves, and to suffer our fellows to do likewise; all learning comes out of ourselves, and no one may communicate his thought; for his thought was given to him for himself alone. Thou art where I was once, thou hast learnt that sacrifices and observances are in vain, that God is in our heart; and it may be that in years to come thy knowledge will be extended, or it may be that thou hast reached the end of thy tether; we are all at tether, Paul."²⁹

The tragedy of the novel, like the tragedy of Vigny's *Mont des Oliviers* and Dujardin's *Le Dieu Mort et Ressuscité*, is incarnate in

²⁸ "Greetings and thanks to all the writers who have written in praise and blame of *The Brook Kerith*; also some admonitions and reproaches to them, for all have fallen into an error that I cannot but think cardinal—that at the end of *The Brook Kerith*, Jesus renounces his claim to divinity. But Jesus lays no claim to divinity in *The Brook Kerith*, neither in the beginning of his career nor at the end of it; the claim does not seem to me to be in accordance with the three synoptic gospels, and I would have my book derivative, and based on the many passages that seem to tell us that a pious Jew could not have done else but turn away horrified if any one of his disciples had asked him if he were the son of God, using the expression 'son of God' in the sense that it is used today in the churches" (*Ibid.*, p. vii). Cf. *La Source du Fleuve Chrétien*, pp. xv-xxv.

²⁹ *The Brook Kerith*, pp. 479-480.

Jesus's realization that this true religion will be vitiated by fanaticism and self-interest, and that nothing is to be done.

FRANCESCO CORDASCO

Long Island University

IRVING AND MOORE: A NOTE ON ANGLO-AMERICAN LITERARY RELATIONS

The friendship of Washington Irving and Thomas Moore provides an interesting chapter in the history of Anglo-American literary relations in the earlier years of the nineteenth century. That the two men should ever have become intimates is especially surprising when one recalls the derisive comments on the Irish poet in *Salmagundi*:

A book's a friend—I always choose
To turn its pages and peruse;
It proved those poems known to fame
For praising every cyprian dame;
The bantlings of a dapper youth,
Renown'd for gratitude and truth;
A little pest, hight Tommy Moore,
Who hopp'd and skip'd our country o'er;
Who sipp'd our tea and lived on sops,
Revel'd on syllabubs and slops,
And when his brain, of cobweb fine,
Was fuddled with five drops of wine,
Would all his puny loves rehearse,
And many a maid debauch—in verse.
Surprised to meet in open view,
A book of such lascivious hue,
I chid my nieces, but they say
'Tis all the passion of the day;
That many a fashionable belle
Will with enraptured accents dwell
On the sweet *morceau* she has found
In this delicious, curst compound! ¹

¹ *The Works of Washington Irving*, Knickerbocker ed. (New York, 1869), xv, 120. Cf. also the poem in which "honest Bunyan's pious dreaming lore" is described as giving place to "the lascivious rhapsodies of Moore" (*Ibid.*, 159-160).

Moore himself, at about the same time, had no very high regard for things American. In 1804, for example, returning from his brief experience as registrar of an Admiralty court in Bermuda, he made a fairly lengthy and leisurely trip through what was then the really important part of America without finding anything worthy of approval apparently except the *Port Folio* group of Philadelphia. With these Anglophiles, Moore reported, he spent

the few agreeable moments which my tour through the States afforded me. Mr. Dennie has succeeded in diffusing through this elegant little circle that love for good literature and sound politics, which he feels so zealously himself, and which is so very rarely the characteristic of his countrymen. They will not, I trust, accuse me of illiberality for the picture which I have given of the ignorance and corruption that surround them. If I did not hate, as I ought, the rabble to which they are opposed, I could not value, as I do, the spirit with which they defy it; and in learning from them what Americans *can be*, I but see with the more indignation what Americans *are*.²

By the eighteen twenties, however, the *Salmagundi* sketch had been either forgotten or forgiven and Moore, in turn, had discovered in a popular New York man of letters what an American *can be*. Their friendship seems to have begun in 1819 in Paris, where Moore was residing as a temporary exile because of the defalcation of his Bermuda deputy and whither Irving had gone after his five-year sojourn in England. By the spring of 1820 the two men had become fast friends. The American, for example, wrote somewhat effusively to Henry Brevoort:

I have become very intimate with Anacreon Moore, who is living here with his family—scarce a day passes without our seeing each other and he has made me acquainted with many of his friends here. He is a charming joyous fellow—full of frank, generous, manly feeling. I am happy to say he expresses himself in the fullest and strongest manner on the subject of his writings on America; which he pronounces the great sin of his early life. . . . His acquaintance is one of the most gratifying things I have met with for some time; as he takes the warm interest of an old friend in me & my concerns.³

² H. M. Jones, *The Harp That Once—A Chronicle of the Life of Thomas Moore* (New York, 1937), p. 82; G. S. Gordon, *Anglo-American Literary Relations* (London, 1942), pp. 33-34; E. P. Oberholtzer, *The Literary History of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1906), p. 179.

³ G. S. Hellman (ed.), *The Letters of Washington Irving to Henry Brevoort* (New York, 1915), II, 144. The letter is dated March 10, 1821.

The friendship of the two writers flourished vigorously for many years and was never really broken off until Moore's death in 1852.

The following apparently hitherto unpublished letter from Moore to Irving supplements what is already known about the relations existing between the two men during 1829 and 1830:

My dear Irving—I got this frank with the intention of writing you a long letter, but according to my usual fate, friendly visitors (who, God knows, deserve anything but that epithet) have popped in & swallowed up all my letter-writing time. A thousand thanks for your efforts in my behalf, and though I had dreams of dollars to an extent somewhat more radiant, one ought to be glad to get any thing—and so I am—that is if I do get it which by the after-clap of your letter does not seem quite so certain.

Your account of my returns of fame is a good deal more splendid—but I am now too much in a pucker about my second volume to enjoy half as much as I ought the success of the First. Next week I hope to see you in town. Mrs. Moore sends her most affectionate regards.

Ever, my dear Irving, Y^{rs}
Most truly,
T. Moore ⁴

Neither place nor date is indicated; however, the latter may be determined with reasonable precision and the former is not particularly relevant.⁵ The fact that the paper is watermarked 1827 automatically fixes this date as the *terminus a quo*. The year 1832 is the *terminus ad quem*, for it was then that Irving gave up his diplomatic post in London and returned to America; Moore's hope of seeing him in town makes it clear that Irving was still in England when the letter was written. These limits, however, may be narrowed somewhat through the reference to the two-volume work—undoubtedly the life of Byron, the first part of which appeared in January, 1830; the second half came precisely a year later. But the latter volume, it should be noted, had been finished by August of 1830.⁶ The letter therefore must have been written

⁴ The letter is in my possession. It is written entirely on one side of a sheet measuring 7¼ by 4½ inches.

⁵ I conjecture that Moore was writing from Sloperton, supposedly his home at this period. Actually, during these years his time was divided between travelling about gathering material for the Byron biography and leading a dizzy social existence in London, at the same time carrying on his writing. Cf. J. Russell, *Memoirs, Journals, and Correspondence of Thomas Moore* (Boston, 1853), VI, *passim*.

⁶ *Ibid.*, VI, 127 (August 20, 1830).

while the author was still at work on that part or, in other words, sometime between January and August of 1830, possibly during the spring or early summer.

More important, however, is the general subject matter of the first paragraph, Irving's very practical interest in furthering his friend's financial rewards in America. Moore was far from being indifferent to these activities of his admirer. In his diary for December 15, 1830, for example, he noted:

Breakfasted at home, expecting Washington Irving to call upon me, and employed in transcribing what remained unfinished of the copy I brought up. Irving came. My American business (that is, the negotiation for me with the American booksellers for their edition of the *Life of Byron*) was the subject I wished to speak to him upon. The sheets have been regularly sent, and he thinks there is no doubt of my receiving the money stipulated for.⁷

Irving did not need much coaxing. In addition to being one of his closest friends during this period, he was also excessively enthusiastic in his praise of Moore as the biographer of Byron. In 1829, for example, after having read the proof sheets, he wrote to Moore:

Your work will be a lasting monument in our literature of the great zeal & tender interest of one illustrious poet for the fame of another. . . . It is this which will give it a wonderful and enduring charm and which will send down the names of Byron & yourself to posterity in glorious companionship.⁸

Again in the same year he wrote to his brother Ebenezer a long letter accompanying the manuscript of the *Life* and urging him to handle it as if it were his own: ". . . that is to say, make the best bargain you can with some principal bookseller for the purchase of it. . . . I am extremely anxious that something very handsome should be procured for this work; therefore do not hesitate to ask a round sum."⁹

The letter here reproduced is, then, in appreciation of Irving's efforts in his behalf, even though his exertions obviously had not

⁷ *Ibid.*, VI, 158.

⁸ For the full quotation cf. S. T. Williams, *The Life of Washington Irving* (New York, 1935), II, 18.

⁹ Pierre Irving (ed.), *The Life and Letters of Washington Irving* (New York, 1865), II, 419-20.

yet succeeded in producing results of a specifically financial nature. Even several month later (January, 1831) Moore was still seeking Irving's intercession:

I don't like to bother a great diplomat such as you are about matters of the shop—particularly as you won't come and be bothered here where I could have my wicked will of you—but time flies, and the golden moment (or rather silver one) for the arrival of my dollars from America ought to be here. Do, like a good fellow, poke them up a little about it, as, if the cash doesn't come, I must—go.¹⁰

Actually, the American edition of the *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron: with Notices of his Life*, which had paralleled the printing of the first English edition (I, 1830; II, 1831), enriched the always debt-ridden Moore to the extent of approximately fifteen hundred dollars.¹¹

THOMAS A. KIRBY

Louisiana State University

SOME IRREGULAR FORMS IN OLD NORSE

I. *Þjófr*: *þjúfr* 'thief.' The phonetically correct form *þjúfr* occurs only sporadically. The normal OIcel. form *þjófr* (with *jó* before the labial *-f*) represents an anomaly which has never been explained. S. Bugge¹ has treated the form *-þjófr* as the second element of proper names but he has made no attempt to explain the irregular *-jó-*, instead of *-jú-*, in this form.

It seems unlikely that the *-jó-* in *þjófr* represents a dialectic survival of *jó* before the labial *f* as in OSwed. *þjöver*, *liöver*² (*liöver* = OIcel. *ljúfr*), for in that case it is inexplicable why a *-jó-* before *f* did not survive in any other established OIcel. form (cf. *ljúfr*).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, II, 421.

¹¹ *Memoirs*, VI, 194 (May, 1831): "Forget whether I have, in any part of my journal, mentioned the course of my money transactions with Murray. At the time when he allowed me to avail myself of whatever I could get from France and America, for an early copy of 'Byron's Life,' to be published there, the sum agreed to by the American publisher was 333 l . . ."

¹ Cf. Sophus Bugge, *Arkiv*, VI, 225-236.

² Cf. Noreen, *Altschwedische Grammatik* ("Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte"), § 82, Anm. 1.

It is most likely that the *-jó-* in OIcel. *þjófr* is of later analogical origin, perhaps due to the influence of words with initial *þjó-*. With the exception of this one word *þjófr* I find no examples of the combination *þjú-*, whereas the combination *þjó-* occurs very frequently; cf. *þjó* 'thigh,' *þjó-nn* 'servant' and related words, *þjó-rr* 'bull,' *þjó-ta* 'howl': *þjó-str* 'anger, fury,' etc. Since the form *þjófr* represents the only example of the *þjú-*-type, it is possible that the normal form *þjófr* originated under the influence of the *þjó-*-type, i. e., that *-jó-* replaced *-jú-* because of the initial *þ-*, in spite of the following labial *f*. The anomalous form OIcel. *þjófr* has always been viewed from the standpoint of the labial *f* which followed the diphthong *-jó-*, but if we view the problem from the standpoint of the initial *þ-*, we may perhaps explain the phonetic irregularity. Initial consonants often furnish the element upon which analogical forms are based; compare, e. g., *slá*, *sló* > *slera* after the pattern of *sá*, *sera* with initial *s-*, but never *þvá*, *þó* > **pvera* with initial *þ-* in spite of the contracted forms of the inf. *sá*: *þvá* with radical vowel *-a*.

II. *Ande* 'spirit.' In the sense of 'spirit' the acc. form *and-a* was occasionally displaced by the nom. form *and-e* (cf. *St. Hom.* and *No. Hom.*). This acc. form *and-e* cannot have been due to leveling in the sing. paradigm, for leveling within the paradigm otherwise always resulted in favor of the oblique cases, and we should therefore have expected a nom. form **and-a* identical with the acc. form *and-a* (cf. *herr-e*: *herr-a*, nom. sing.). The acc. sing. form *and-e* must therefore have been due to the influence of some other declensional type which preserved the ending *-e* in both the nom. and acc. form. Such a declensional type exists in the fem. *in*-stems (cf. *ell-e*, nom.-acc. form). Among the fem. *in*-abstracts are forms ending in the suffix *-and-e*, such as *hyggj-and-e* 'understanding, intelligence.' The type *hyggj-and-e*, nom.-acc. form, furnishes not only the suffix *-and-e* identical in form with the independent word *and-e*, but also an abstract sense 'intelligence' parallel to the abstract sense of *and-e* 'spirit.' Therefore, it is possible that the ending *-e* in the acc. sing. form *and-e* was borrowed from the nom. sing. form *and-e* under the influence of the declensional type *hyggj-and-e*, nom.-acc., in spite of the difference in gender. This hypothesis would account for the irregular leveling in favor of the nom. form *and-e* and seems all the more plausible in that only in the acc. sing. — never in the gen. and dat. sing. — and only in the abstract sense of 'spirit' — never in the concrete sense of

'breath' — does the form *and-e* occur in place of historically correct *and-a*.

III. *Fjós* > *þjós* 'cadaver of a whale.' In *fjós* > *þjós* we apparently have an isolated example of the shift of initial *f-* to *þ-* in ON. The primary form *fjós* has been explained as representing an earlier form **fljós* (< PGmc **fleus-ō* 'something cut or split off') with the loss of *-l-* due to dissimilation in conjunction with the *l* in *hval-* in the compound [*hval*] **fljós* > *-fjós*.³ Since the shift of initial *f-* > *þ-* in ON seems to be restricted⁴ to this one example *fjós* > *þjós*, it seems most likely that this shift was not due to initial position but rather to further dissimilation in the compound *hval-fjós*. In this compound we have a labial spirant *v* (= *u*) in *hval-* and a labial spirant *f* in *-fjós*. Therefore, *v:f* could have been dissimilated to *v:þ* (*hval-fjós* > *hval-þjós*) parallel to, e.g., the dissimilation of *f:f* (= *ð*) to *f:d* in OIcel. *fi-f-rilde* > Mod. Icel. *fi-ð-rildi* 'butterfly'.⁵ This seems all the more probable in that only the form *þjós* survives in Mod. Icel. and is undoubtedly of late origin. According to both Fritzner and Cleasby-Vigfússon the form *þjós* occurs only in the *Jónsbók*. Since the citations are from the edition of 1709 (Holum), it is possible that the form *þjós* originated about this time.

IV. *Hjalm-þér* > *Hjalm-tér*. The irregular *t* for *þ* in *-þér* (< **þewar*) cannot be explained as phonetically correct. The most plausible explanation of this *t* is that it was borrowed from the form *-týr* with which it was associated in the compound *Hjalm-týr*. This assumption is supported by the fact that of all the proper names compounded with *-þér* none has a corresponding form in *-týr* and none appears with the irregular *t* for *þ* (cf. *Egg-þér*, *Ham-þér*, *Sig-þér*, etc.) except *Hjalm-þér*. That the element *-þér* could be confused with *-týr* is supported by the example of the proper name *Angan-týr*, which no doubt was originally identical with

³ Cf. A. Fick, *Vgl. Wörterbuch der indo-germ. Sprachen*, under *flus*, 2, spalten, 255, and Falk-Torp, *Norw.-Dän. etymologisches Wörterbuch* under *Flos*, II, Vol. I, 240.

⁴ Noreen (*Urgerm. Lautlehre*, § 54, 1) cites one other example in ON, viz., *fél:þél* 'Feile'; but it is not certain that these two forms are identical in origin.

⁵ The *-ð-* in Mod. Icel. *fi-ð-rildi* may be in part due to association with the *-ð-* in *fjo-ð-r* 'feather'; see Walde-Pokorny, II, 52. But this factor does not invalidate the hypothesis of dissimilation.

the OE *Ongen-péow* = ON **Angan-pér* (re-formed to *Angan-týr*). Finally, the fact that the irregular *t* in *Hjalm-tér* was not preserved after the long vowel *é* had been shortened (i. e., **Hjalm-ter* parallel to *Hjalm-der*) is further evidence of association with the *t* in *-týr* before the long vowel *y*.

V. *The Adjectival Superlative Suffix -rst:-st.* In adjectives with the superlative suffix *-st* (< **-ist*) the *r* of the comparative suffix is occasionally carried over into the superlative form (cf. *fár*, *fá-re*, *fá-str* > *fá-rstr*; *ung*, *þ-re*, *þ-rstr*, etc.). This transference was evidently due to the example of adjectives in which an organic *r* of the stem syllable was present before the superlative suffix *-st*, such as *ver-re*, *ver-str*; *fyr-re*, *fyr-str*, especially since, through loss⁶ of this *r*, doublet forms resulted, *verstr:vestr*, *fyrstr:fyst*, parallel to the type *fástr:færstr*. Confusion between organic and inorganic *r* could thus easily have led to the transference in question (cf. the similar confusion in the nominal declension, such as *Tý-r*, *Tý-s* > *Týr-s* after the pattern of *dýr*, *dýrs*). This confusion was possible only in the *i*-type of comparison, where the *r* immediately preceded the suffix and thus could be felt either as a part of the stem or as belonging to the suffix. No such confusion was possible in the *ō*-type of comparison, where on account of the intervening vowel *a* an organic *r* could not immediately precede the suffix (cf. *vittr-are*, *vittr-astr*, hence always *spak-are*, *spak-astr*, never **spak-arstr*, parallel to *ver-str:fá-rstr*).

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

University of Kansas

CHAUCER REDIVIVUS

Early in 1944, when the Americans were massing in England against the invasion of Normandy, there appeared in *Punch* the following unsigned poem entitled "The Warden":

With hem ther cam a man of smale lengthe,
Yet thik and brood, and therwith gret of strengthe;
Certes, he nas nat lyk a pyned goste;
I gesse he was the maister of a poste,

⁶ Through assimilation of *rs* > *ss* (cf. *fors* > *foss*) and the simplification of *ss* > *s* before the *t* of the suffix.

And kepte wel for everich incidente
 Ther as he hadde warde and gouvernemente.
 He hadde a murie chere, and eyen brighte,
 And sayde he coude see a shining lighte
 Though it were dark with blindes half a score,
 Or shoon but at the kinkes of a dore.
 Whan that the horne waylede up and doune
 Ther nas no man so quik to here his soune;
 He waytede ofte on everich happe and chaunce;
 Of bombes coude he al the olde daunce.
 For his arraye, he was accoutred wel:
 His hat was round as it were any bel,
 And ther-on stod y-write a twinned U;
 His shoon were stoute; his habergeoun was blew;
 Therto he heng his lanterne al bifore;
 Nobby he highte: soth, I noot namore.¹

It is obvious from these verses that they are the work of a man steeped in *The Canterbury Tales*. They are in good Chaucerian English, with many an echo of Chaucer's own phrasing; they are in the riming couplets that Chaucer used so effectively; they follow the pattern that Chaucer laid down for himself in lines 38-41 of the Prologue; and they capture the spirit of the portraits of those fourteenth-century pilgrims who made the journey from Southwark to Canterbury.

In subsequent issues of *Punch* other pieces in the same manner, though of different lengths and varying degrees of excellence, were published, the work of G. H. Vallins.² And lest they be overlooked by Chaucer scholars, a list of these other portraits of war-time Englishmen is given here:

The Sergeant-Major	ccvi (16 February 1944), 136
The Land Girl	ccvi (23 February 1944), 160
The Announcer	ccvi (1 March 1944), 176
The Merchant Seaman	ccvi (22 March 1944), 246
The Housewife	ccvi (26 April 1944), 354
The Scolemistresse	ccvii (13 September 1944), 225
The Soldier	ccvii (11 October 1944), 311

¹ *Punch* ccvi (26 January 1944), 70. Quotation from these verses is made with the kind permission of the proprietors of *Punch*.

² The name of the author is revealed in the semi-annual index to *Punch*. It may be noted in passing that Vallins does not confine himself to imitations of Chaucer. He has published in *Punch* verses in the manner of many of Chaucer's successors from Spenser to Housman.

The Conductresse	CCVII (18 October 1944), 330
The Fuginer	CCVIII (3 January 1945), 10
The Poste-Wif	CCVIII (14 February 1945), 138

Shortly after the defeat of the Germans there was published in the same magazine "And Pilgrims were they Alle," verses which may be compared to the links in the framework of *The Canterbury Tales*. Stopping for the night at "a litel toun y-clept Ospringe," the pilgrims are addressed in high seriousness by The Announcer:

Thinketh on hem that in this fighte han fought
 With brave intente, and al this work han wrought,
 And of this londe were the strength and sheeld;
 But som are ded up-on a ferne feeld,
 That were oure frendes dere, and come nat hame,
 And for hem alle we han grete greef and grame.³

Whereupon the pilgrims pass a while in meditation, from which they are roused by The Host:

"Now drinketh," quod oure Host, "bi-fore ye go,
 For we are in o felawshipe y-bonde
 With men and wommen in this faire londe,
 And with hem alle that in the werre were slayn,
 Both neigh and fer, and come nat back ageyn,
 That to us alle, y-wis, were lief and dere.
 I preye yow drinke your wine, and han god chere."

The war over, Vallins' Chaucerian imitations have continued, though they do not appear so frequently as they once did. In what may well be an incomplete series of portraits of English sportsmen five pieces have been published:

The Golfer	CCIX (17 October 1945), 332
The Footballer	CCX (13 March 1946), 219
The Cricketer	CCX (26 June 1946), 548
The Darts Player	CCXI (4 September 1946), 184
The Motor Cyclist	CCXI (30 October 1946), 370

None of these are, of course, great poems, for they are but examples of the imitator's skill. Yet they are deserving of mention because they make up another chapter in the unfinished volume on Chaucer's modernity.

HENRY BOSLEY WOOLF

Louisiana State University

³ *Punch* CCVIII (9 May 1945), 398.

BEOWULF AND GRENDEL: AN ANALOGUE FROM
BURMA

A hitherto unrecorded analogue to the Beowulf-Grendel fight is to be found in an article recently published in *The American Scholar*.¹ Writing of Burmese legends told him during his service with O. W. I. in Burma by an American, a missionary's son who had spent his childhood in that region, Adie Suehsdorf introduces his readers to the "tok":

Worst of all is the "tok." This is an ape-like creature of pure horror, somewhat like Beowulf's Grendel. My friend was not reluctant to speak of the "tok," but the pleasure went out of his voice. He had seen the demon twice. Once he had wrestled with it and nearly lost his life.

It was in eastern Burma that he was awakened one night by a noise in the living room of his bungalow. Taking a shotgun, he entered the room. A shaft of moonlight cut across it, and in the darkness beyond was the beast. The man fired and hit the thing full in the chest. Streaming blood, it leapt upon him and in silence they wrestled, each seeking to throttle the other.

My friend always lost himself at this point. He grew vague on details, but stuck, like a browbeaten but dogged witness, to his main points: the terror that gripped him, and the feel of the rough hair on the heaving, living body of the "tok."

The struggle ended when the "tok" suddenly broke away and ran out into the night, leaving my friend exhausted and with a handful of its hair.

In daylight (and here he grew firmer again), he followed the "tok's" blood-stained trail till it vanished in the jungle beside a plant which the natives use to stanch their wounds. He has never seen the creature since.²

Though Suehsdorf casually refers to the similarity between the "tok" and Grendel, he is not concerned with pointing out specific likenesses between his friend's struggle and the first of Beowulf's great fights. It is, therefore, proper to note here that in the Burmese tale and in the Old English poem, there is (1) a terrifying monster known to men; (2) a nocturnal visitation of the monster to the dwelling-place of men; (3) a wrestling-match between the monster and a man; (4) a hasty departure of the monster, with a part of itself left in the man's possession; (5) a

¹ Adie Suehsdorf, "Burma Was Jungle Noises," *The American Scholar* xv (Summer, 1946), 356-359.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 358-359.

trail of blood by which, next day, the man can follow the monster's course; (6) the disappearance of the monster from the haunts of men after that fight.

HENRY BOSLEY WOOLF

Louisiana State University

ANOTHER NOTE ON DRYDEN'S USE OF GEORGES DE SCUDÉRY'S *ALMAHIDE*

In an earlier article,¹ I pointed out that since Dryden made use of Georges de Scudéry's *Almahide* as the source of *Almanzor and Almahide*, he could have found his inspiration for the episode of Ozmyn and Benzayda in the intercalated story of Abdalla and Fatime, also in *Almahide* (vi, p. 2581 ff.). In that article I did not offer any evidence to refute Mr. Montague Summers' inference that Dryden possibly made use of the episode of Osman and Alibech in *Ibrahim*.²

It seems apparent that Dryden did not use *Ibrahim* for the following reasons:

As cited above, the main details of the episode are to be found in *Almahide*. Having found the model for a beautiful love story in his principal source, why then should he have found it necessary to seek out another version in a second work?

In *Ibrahim*, the hero's father is moved to consent to the marriage of his son to Alibech, not as a result of a change of heart but because of the generous dowry offered by the Sultan Soliman. In Dryden's play and in *Almahide* an obdurate heart is finally moved to compassion by the spirit of self-sacrifice evinced by the two lovers in a combat of generosity, and especially by the *vertu* of the heroine. Note the similarity between the following lines:

Abenamar. Yes, I am vanquish'd! the fierce conflict's past;
And shame it self is now o'recome at last.

Benzayda, 'twas your Vertue vanquish'd me:
That, could alone surmount my Cruelty.

(Dryden, Part II, Act IV, Sc. 1, p. 132)

¹ "Dryden's Use of Scudéry's *Almahide*," *MLN*, LIV (March, 1939), 190-2.

² *Dryden, the Dramatic Works*, III, 12, London, the Nonesuch Press, 1932.

Je suis vaincu, ô trop genereuse Fille! s'écria Palsi: vostre vertu est plus forte que ma cruauté: & je ne luy sçaurois plus resister.

(*Almahide*, VI, p. 2860, ll. 6 ff.)

Elsewhere I find:

Ozmyn. Alas, 'tis counterfeited rage; he [Selin] strives
But to divert the danger from our lives.
For, I can witness, Sir, and you might see
How in your person he consider'd me.
He still declin'd the Combate where you were;

(*loc. cit.*, p. 131)

Considerez donc Seigneur, lui [Palsi] dit Isa . . . si vous pouvez sans iniustice, vous resoudre à la perte d'un homme, qui voyant son Pere Captif, a pourtant eu assez de respect, pour ne vous combattre point, parce que vous estes le mien?

(*loc. cit.*, p. 2857, ll. 7 ff.)

All action in Dryden's play, such as the clashes between the two fathers, takes place, as in *Almahide*, on land. In *Ibrahim* the principals engage in sea battles. In one incident in *Almahide* the two parents attempt to engage in hand-to-hand fighting; the hero stands between them and parries the one and the other's blows. Likewise, in Dryden, Ozmyn shields the body of Benzayda's father with his own while parrying the blows struck against the latter by his own father. (Act II, p. 104, Summers ed.)

There are several important differences between Dryden's episode and the original. In the former, it is Selin, Benzayda's father, who is captive of Abenamar, Ozmyn's father, as the action moves to its conclusion. The situation is reversed in *Almahide*, for it is Isa's father, Palsi, whose heart must be moved to release her lover's father and consent to their marriage. In *Almahide* the two parents, members of the principal warring factions in Granada, have been unjustly discredited and in revenge have turned to piracy. In Dryden, piracy is deleted. In *Almahide* the two lovers invoke the aid of intermediaries to win their fathers over, while in Dryden's play they are victors through their own words and acts.

JEROME W. SCHWEITZER

The University of Alabama

HENRY NEEDLER'S KNOWLEDGE OF SHAFTESBURY¹

C. A. Moore has expressed the opinion that Henry Needler was the first literary follower of Shaftesbury, an opinion based primarily on parallel passages from Shaftesbury in the footnotes to *The Works of Mr. Henry Needler . . . Publish'd by Mr. Duncombe* (London, 1728, 2nd ed.) and on a letter of December 3, 1711, from Needler to William Duncombe, the editor of his works.² In this letter Needler discusses the Cartesian doctrine of animal insensibility and the problem of individual consciousness (two matters touched upon by Shaftesbury), thanks Duncombe for sending him "the fine *Philosophical Meditations* of my Lord Shaftesbury," and concludes with a rhapsodic prose-hymn in praise of nature and providence, which he particularly ascribes to the inspiration of Shaftesbury's meditations. Herbert Drennon, disagreeing with Moore's interpretation, has pointed out that the footnotes to Needler's works are Duncombe's, not Needler's, and has asserted that as far as he knows Needler never "referred to Shaftesbury except in the letter of December 3, 1711."³ He also suggested that this letter indicates Needler's first acquaintance with Shaftesbury, and that Needler had not read *The Moralists* or the *Characteristics*, but had seen only "the fine *Philosophical Meditation*" in the form of a passage copied out of Shaftesbury by Duncombe and sent to Needler in a letter.

There are two other relevant published letters, which show that Needler was quite familiar with Shaftesbury's works and that he, rather than Duncombe, was considered as the authority on Shaftesbury.⁴ The two, one by Duncombe and the other by Needler, continue the discussion begun in Needler's letter of December 3, 1711. On December 8, 1711, Duncombe replies to this letter with a long paraphrase of two numbers of the *Spectator* (120, 121) supporting the theory that animal instinct is owing to the immediate

¹ This note was written during research on the influence of Shaftesbury carried on with the support of a grant from the American Philosophical Society.

² "Shaftesbury and the Ethical Poets in England, 1700-1760," *PMLA*, xxxi (1916), 264-325.

³ "Henry Needler and Shaftesbury," *PMLA*, xlvi (1931), 1095-1106.

⁴ John Duncombe, *Letters by Several Eminent Persons Deceased* (London, 1773), 2nd ed., 3 vols. I (Letters xix and xx), pp. 75-93.

direction of the supreme Being and with a lengthy anecdote of his own to show that animals have a real soul and rational faculties, inferior to human. Then he quotes a paragraph from "the *Epistolae Miscellaniae* annexed to Mr. Ralphson's *Demonstratio de Deo*, p. 67" concerning the nature of the soul.

Remarkable of old was the opinion of those (and it is still embraced by some) that the soul is a ray, as it were, or emanation, of the Deity. Of this opinion formerly were the Stoics, and among the moderns are some enthusiasts, whom it is needless to name. Nor do those philosophers deserve more notice, who have established a "common intelligence," or a "sole universal intellect," which they style the "Agent," and impart it to mankind in proportion to the various minds and dispositions of their organs. Similar to this among the moderns are the notions of Spinoza.

Duncombe then gives his reasons for transcribing this passage:

1. To desire you to explain to me the difference between these notions; for Mr. R. speaks as of two distinct opinions, whereas they seem to me to be but one, and the same. And 2. That I might not be thought too severe in saying, that if lord Shaftesbury be one of those enthusiasts, of whom Mr. R. here speaks, and if his "universal genius" is the same as is here called the "universal intellect," I do not see how he can believe the immortality of the soul, considered as one distinct individual being; since it is plain, according to these notions, that the mind will, at the dissolution of the body, be swallowed up in the infinite abyss of being.⁵

In a letter of December 20, 1711, Needler expresses an opinion on these subjects as well as on the various theories concerning animals, preferring the Cartesian mechanistic hypothesis, which makes all the actions of beasts the necessary effects of the laws of motion, to the *Spectator's* theory, which resolves their actions into "the external impulse and operation of the Divine Power." On the notions concerning the soul—the principles which concern Shaftesbury—Needler's comments are revealing. He cites Blount's comparison in the *Oracles of Reason* of the soul, when joined to the body, to a small portion of the sea enclosed in a vial; and when separated from the body, to the same water restored to the ocean

⁵It is extremely doubtful that Raphson was speaking of Shaftesbury since the letter which Duncombe translates is dated December 14, 1706. Joseph Raphson, *Demonstratio de Deo sive Methodus ad cognitionem Dei naturalem brevis ac demonstrativa* (londini, 1710), p. 71. The only works of Shaftesbury published at this time were the anonymous preface to *Select Sermons of Dr. Whichcote*, 1698, and the anonymous *An Inquiry concerning Virtue and Merit*, 1699.

by the breaking of the vial. Needler regards this simile as absurd since God is an uncompounded being, and one cannot pluck off "snips and pieces from the Divine Essence." Needler condemns, in addition to the enthusiasts who entertain these notions of a Deity divisible into separate particles, those also who, like Spinoza, assume the same common intellect to be imparted to all men. He cannot without satisfaction, he continues,

observe these pernicious opinions (which undermine the foundations of religion, and blast all our hopes of immortality and future happiness, by taking away the personal distinction of the soul after death), so easily refuted and overthrown.

At this point he focusses the discussion upon Shaftesbury.

I must confess there are some passages in lord Shaftesbury's "meditations," which seem to favour this notion; but, however, I believe there are none (allowance being made for the warmth and freedom of his style) which there is any necessity of understanding in that ill sense. It would be great pity that so pious and elevated a strain of devotion should be tainted with such poisonous notions. I find, though his lordship is reported not to frequent the church, he does not altogether neglect religion. He seems to be of the opinion of the *Quietists*, who believe that the most acceptable worship of the Deity, and that which suits best with his spiritual nature, consists in silent contemplation and inward adoration of his infinite perfections.

This paragraph vindicates Moore to the extent of revealing Needler to be acquainted with Shaftesbury's works and perhaps his personal life as well.

The establishing of Needler's knowledge of Shaftesbury does not greatly affect the general thesis of Drennon's article, that other writers besides Shaftesbury could have influenced the passages in Needler's works which resemble the *Characteristics*, but the probability is increased that Shaftesbury's influence did count materially. The significance of the parallel passages suggested by Duncombe should not be entirely discounted, for it seems plausible that Duncombe, Needler's close friend and patron, should have some notion of Needler's intellectual history. Drennon is willing to accept Duncombe's parallel between Newton and Needler. Why then must we reject those parallels referring to Shaftesbury?

Any paragraph from Needler's essay "On the Beauty of the Universe," which imitates Shaftesbury's glowing descriptions of innumerable details in the universe from insects to suns, would

seem natural coming from the lips of Theocles. The rhapsody in both the letter to Duncombe and in "On the Beauty of the Universe" could have been inspired by Henry More's *Divine Dialogues* or the appendix to John Norris's *The Theory and Regulation of Love*, close analogues to *The Moralists*, but the letter to Duncombe, which Needler himself attributes to the influence of Shaftesbury, has less resemblance to *The Moralists* than has "On the Beauty of the Universe." The possibility of Shaftesbury's influence cannot be discarded.

ALFRED OWEN ALDRIDGE

University of Buffalo

AUTHENTICITY OF "THE WISH" AS A ROCHESTER POEM

That witty little six-line poem called "The Wish," dealing with the regeneration of a man within the womb of his mistress, has apparently been unquestionably accepted into the body of Rochester's poetical works. It is included without editorial qualm in the two modern collected editions, that of Mr. John Hayward (Nonesuch Press, 1926) and that of Mr. Quilter Johns (Haworth Press, 1933); its authenticity has likewise not been questioned elsewhere.

The poem does not occur in the earliest collected editions of Rochester's works. Mr. Hayward reprints it from the 1731 edition and Mr. Johns, identically, from that of 1739; it appeared in the editions of 1714 and 1721 as well as in many later editions. Its presence, with an attribution to Rochester, in an important Harvard manuscript collection compiled between approximately 1680 and 1685¹ might be expected to confirm the accepted authorship, especially in view of the lack of other contemporary authority.

It seems to have been overlooked, however, that the poem appeared in print in 1661 in the second part of *Merry Drollery* under the title "Insatiate Desire."² Although one is not inclined to

¹ MS Eng 636F, pp. 75-76. I am indebted to the Librarian of The Houghton Library of Harvard University for permission to publish from this manuscript; I expect to communicate from it in the near future certain material dealing with Rochester and other Restoration poets.

² The songs from the 1661 *Merry Drollery* which (like this one) do not appear in later editions (1670, 1691) are included in J. Woodfall Ebsworth's edition of *Choyce Drollery: Songs & Sonnets* (Boston, Lincolnshire, 1876). "Insatiate Desire," p. 239.

argue against Rochester's precocity in certain fields, it is incredible that he composed this mature piece at such an age that it could find its way into print in a drollery by the time that he was barely fourteen. The fact that he had entered Oxford a year and a few months earlier and the gratuitous speculation by Professor V. de Sola Pinto that he contracted venereal disease during his residency there³ cannot account for the experience—much less the skill—displayed in the poem. Furthermore, disregarding the three juvenile pieces said to have been written at the age of twelve (but probably in whole or in part by Robert Whitehall),⁴ Rochester's poetical career has not been shown to have commenced until some four years after this time. Perhaps regretfully, one must omit "the Wish" from the list of genuine Rochester pieces.

For such interest as the poem may have for its own sake, a collation is presented of the drollery, manuscript, and eighteenth-century versions mentioned above.⁵ Although the readings are quite similar, only for the fifth line are they all identical. No one is uniformly outstanding, and each is in one or more particulars superior to the others.

JAMES THORPE

Princeton University

AN ATTEMPTED PIRACY OF *THE DUENNA*

Although the sensational popularity of *The Duenna* in November, 1775 made a large section of the reading public eager to see the

³ *Rochester* (London, John Lane, 1935), pp. 11-12.

⁴ For titles and texts, see Hayward, pp. 49-51. For comment, see Hayward, p. 330 and Vincent de Sola Pinto, pp. 12-13.

⁵ *Merry Drollery*—*D*; Harvard Manuscript—*MS*; Eighteenth-century version as typified in the 1731 and 1739 editions—*18*. (Variations in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization are ignored.)

Title. Insatiate Desire (*D*)] The Wish (*MS*), (*18*).

1. could by any (*D*)] could by some new (*MS*); now cou'd, by some (*18*).

2. To sperme, convert my spirit (*D*)] Transfuse my Sperme, my Vitalls (*MS*); To sperme convert my Vitals (*18*).

3. That (*D*), (*18*)] And (*MS*): I might my (*D*), (*18*)] my verry (*MS*).

4. And in her w... my self degenerate (*D*)] Into her Womb and bee regenerate (*MS*); And in the Womb myself regenerate (*18*).

6. Then (*D*), (*18*)] And (*MS*): (*D*)] Swine (*MS*); . . . (*18*): back (*D*), (*MS*)] out (*18*).

book of the opera, Sheridan and Thomas Harris (to whom Sheridan later sold the copyright) withheld the full text until 1794, when the opera had cooled in the affections of the theatre-goers. But theatre custom and public demand were both met when the songs, printed for T. Wilkie and T. Evans, were placed on sale almost immediately after the *première*. From these printed songs and from the memories of men like Tate Wilkinson, *The Governess* and other piratical texts of *The Duenna* were compiled,¹ undoubtedly to the indignation of Richard Brinsley Sheridan. The following résumé of a previously unnoted Chancery suit² reveals an effort by him to reserve to himself his right in music.

The Duenna was first performed 21 November 1775; the music was published within two months, 8 January 1776. Sheridan's success stimulated the foremost music publisher of London, Charles and Samuel Thompson, to purchase the music copyright for £150, plus £50 more if the opera played more than thirty nights, and £50 more for a sixty night run. One hundred pounds was paid on agreement.

Straightway the Thompsons had the words and music engraved, "at a very great Expence," and published several copies of the book at ten shillings sixpence. But just as Ryder and others pirated the words, so still others attempted to pirate the music. In their Bill of Complaint, sworn 18 April 1776, Sheridan and the Thompson's charged

that one Robert Falkener of Peterborough Court Fleet Street London hath lately. . . . Printed Published and Sold as your Orators charge for a very large Profit several of the Words and Music of the said Composition and still Continues and persists so to do.

In an attempt to stop Falkener, Sheridan wrote him a note, 6 March, pointing out that *The Duenna* had been entered at Stationers Register on 2 March and that any unpermitted publication would be prosecuted. Falkener disregarded Sheridan's warning, however, and advertised in the *Daily Advertiser*, 7 March 1776, that the public might buy at one penny a page "Eight of the most favourite

¹ See *The Plays & Poems of Richard Brinsley Sheridan*, ed. R. Crompton Rhodes (Oxford, 1928), I, 255-276.

² Public Records Office C12/1355/14, Bill of Complaint of Richard Brinsley Sheridan, Charles Thompson, and Samuel Thompson, 18 April 1776.

Songs" in *The Duenna* at J. Bland's place at 114 Long Acre. Sheridan and the Thompsons alleged that the overture and the eleven songs were included in this piracy.³ The three complainants asked that a writ of subpoena be issued against Falkener and that, accounting for his profits, he surrender them to the rightful owners of *The Duenna* copy.

In his answer, sworn August 1779, Falkener admitted that it might be true that Sheridan had written *The Duenna*, that the Thompsons may have agreed to publish it, and that Sheridan may have entered it in the Stationers' Register. As to the music, Falkener stated that

he did print and Sell some music notes part of his own Composing and other Part thereof taken from Music Notes some of which had been printed upwards of forty years ago as this Defendant believes, and others of them had been printed upwards of Twenty eight years ago and both which Periods of time being many years before the alleged Composition or Music or work.⁴

Falkener added that the money which he had received from this publication had been "trifling and inconsiderable"; furthermore, on being served with an injunction from the court he had stopped printing the work.

As in many cases like this, nothing but the Bill and Answer seems to have survived. There is no reason to doubt Falkener's statement that he had stopped printing upon being served with an injunction. Undoubtedly he realized that an insistence upon his alleged right would involve a greater expense than the sum of the contemplated profits. Anyhow, Sheridan was apparently successful in his appeal to the court, for all copies of the Falkener printing seem to have disappeared.

HOWARD P. VINCENT

Illinois Institute of Technology

³ The songs listed in the Bill are the ones printed today in Rhodes' edition: 1, 194, 198, 200, 203, 207, 214, 224, 227, 233, 236, and 237.

⁴ C12/1355/14, Answer of Robert Falkener to the Bill and to the Revivor, dated 30 August 1779. The Revivor had been required because of the death of one of the plaintiffs, Charles Thompson, on 10 February 1777. The Bill of Revivor is dated 13 January 1778; in it the plaintiffs stated that Falkener had been served an injunction on 7 May 1776.

"SOOTH" IN DE LA MARE, KEATS, AND MILTON

Readers of Walter De la Mare's pleasant fantasy *Sam's Three Wishes: or Life's Little Whirligig* may well have lingered appreciatively over the description of small Sammie's mother with her

. . . smooth, clear cheek,
Lips as sooth as a blackbird's beak . . .

without being inquisitive as to how *sooth* became a synonym for *smooth*.

As De Selincourt acknowledges in his edition of Keats,¹ H. Buxton Forman was the first to observe that Keats' employment of *soother* in the oft-quoted line from *The Eve of St. Agnes*,

With jellies soother than the creamy curd,

is "in a measure indebted to Milton's use of the superlative 'the *soothest* shepherd,' *Comus*, 823," though Keats changes its meaning to *softer* or *smoother*. Keats' own use of the superlative may be observed in the sonnet addressed to "*soothest* Sleep," wherein the epithet presumably carries the same distortion of meaning.

Apparently Keats departed from all precedent in his interpretation of this word simply because of a misunderstanding that can easily be explained. Though fully possessed of the fact that the allegorical reference to "old Meliboeus" in *Comus* as "the *soothest* shepherd that ever piped on plain" is but a thinly disguised poetic compliment to his own and Milton's favorite poet, Spenser, Keats himself did not quite share Milton's view of Spenser. To Milton, Spenser was a great moralist, "a better teacher than Scotus or Aquinas," *soothest* being employed by Milton in its legitimate Middle English or Chaucerian meaning of *most truthful*. To Keats, on the contrary, Spenser was chiefly endeared as a mellifluous, sweet or *smooth*-voiced singer of limpid verse, not a moral teacher at all; hence Keats' unusual employment of an epithet picked up from his reading of *Comus* and introduced into the English language, in this new sense, according to the *NED*, by Keats in the poems of 1819 and 1820.

In De la Mare's perpetuation of this significance of the word,

¹ Sixth Revised Edition (1935), p. 471.

never a popularly accepted one, lies fairly conclusive evidence of the same sort of poetic appropriation from *The Eve of St. Agnes* that Keats had himself made from *Comus*, but at least De la Mare has contented himself with the meaning as Keats left it.

CHARLES E. MOUNTS

University of Florida

A NOTE ON THE SETTING OF MARY NOAILLES
MURFREE'S "THE 'HARNT' THAT WALKS
CHILHOWEE"

Although the general setting of Mary Noailles Murfree's story, "The 'Harnt' that Walks Chilhowee" is her usual vague and romantic one, three details of the description appear to localize it on Chilhowee Mountain in Blount County, Tennessee, above the site of Montvale Springs hotel: the road leading down the mountain from the Giles cabin and passing a fork, the scene of Reuben Crabb's "murder," is on the mountain's western side (on its eastern side the road does not fork); it is a mile to this fork from the cabin, or from the top of the mountain; it is eight miles "along the ridge" from the cabin to Crabb's house near a sulphur spring, which is the distance between Montvale and Alleghany or Yellow Sulphur Springs, also at the foot of Chilhowee Mountain.¹

Miss Murfree did visit Montvale Springs in the fall of 1885, when she presumably gathered material for *The Prophet of the Great Smoky Mountains*.² If the internal evidence of "The 'Harnt'" is admitted, she was there before June 1882, when she announced the story ready for publication.

NATHALIA WRIGHT

*Maryville, College,
Maryville, Tennessee*

¹ *In the Tennessee Mountains* (Boston, 1894), pp. 304, 307, 310, 316, 318, 295, 307, 294.

² Edd Winfield Parks, *Charles Egbert Craddock* (Chapel Hill, c 1941), pp. 129-131.

REVIEWS

The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth: Miscellaneous Sonnets, Memorials of Various Tours, Poems Dedicated to National Independence and Liberty, The Egyptian Maid, The River Duddon Series, The White Doe and Other Narrative Poems, Ecclesiastical Sonnets. Edited by E. DE SELINCOURT and HELEN DARBISHIRE. Oxford: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford University Press], 1946. Pp. xxiv + 596. \$6.50.

"When he died, in May 1943," Miss Darbishire informs us, "Professor de Selincourt left the copy for the last three volumes of this edition of Wordsworth's Poetical Works in a state substantially ready for publication, with injunctions that I should see it through the press." But since Miss Darbishire had done a good deal on the manuscript of this, as of the preceding volumes,¹ her part is not limited to seeing the work through the press. This third volume includes most of the poet's sonnets and memorials of tours together with *The White Doe*. It is greatly to be hoped that the two remaining parts will contain not only the other minor poems and *The Excursion* but *The Prelude*. Nearly a third of the present volume is given over to notes: those the poet published, those he dictated to Miss Fenwick, extracts from letters and Dorothy's journals, parallels, and matters of fact. Although there is little comment and almost no discussion of the purpose or meaning of the several poems, what is new in the notes is always admirable and it is a great assistance to have all the relevant information about a poem brought together for the first time in one place.

The previously-unpublished readings of manuscripts show that Wordsworth's revisions were generally improvements but otherwise they are rarely noteworthy. The first two lines of the sonnet "Composed on a May Morning, 1838":

Life with yon Lambs, like day, is just begun,
Yet Nature seems to them a heavenly guide,

were originally:

Yon mountain lambs whose life is just begun,
A guidance know, to Man's grave years denied.

The sonnet, "O Friend! I know not which way I must look For comfort," at first began, "Coleridge! I know not. . . ." The im-

¹ See *MLN* for November, 1943 and March, 1945.

pressive acknowledgment of Wordsworth's debt to Burns "Whose light . . ."

showed my youth
How Verse may build a princely throne
On humble truth

formerly read:

When, breaking forth like Nature's own,
And led my youth
To Poesy that built her throne
On simple truth²

To the poem following the one from which this last quotation is taken, "Thoughts Suggested the Day Following," Wordsworth added in 1842 a note which is here published for the first time. I quote the significant parts of it:

Familiarity with the dialect of the border counties of Cumberland and Westmorland made it easy for me not only to understand but to feel them [Burns' poems]. It was not so with his contemporary or rather his predecessor Cowper. . . . It gives me pleasure, venial I trust, to acknowledge at this late day my obligations to these two great authors [Burns and Cowper], whose writings, in conjunction with Percy's *Reliques*, powerfully counteracted the mischievous influence of Darwin's dazzling manner, the extravagance of the earlier dramas of Schiller, and that of other German writers upon my taste and natural tendencies. May these few words serve as a warning to youthful Poets who are in danger of being carried away by the inundation of foreign literature, from which our own is at present suffering so much, both in style and points of far greater moment. True it is that in the poems of Burns, as now collected, are too many reprehensible passages; but their immorality is rather the ebullition of natural temperament and a humour of levity than a studied thing: whereas in these foreign Writers, and in some of our own country not long deceased (and in an eminent deceased Poet of our own age), the evil, whether of voluptuousness, impiety, or licentiousness, is courted upon system, and therefore is greater, and less pardonable.³

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

Wordsworth's Reading of Roman Prose. By JANE WORTHINGTON.
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1946. Pp. xvi + 84.
\$2.50.

Miss Worthington has done a substantial service to Wordsworth scholarship by reminding us, with documentary proof, that the

² It would seem that some unrecorded change in the manuscript fitted the first line quoted to those that follow. Cf. p. 442 n. where a later correction cannot be substituted for the text unless changes are made.

³ Pp. 441-2. This note was added in manuscript to the note which Wordsworth printed after the poem in 1842 and later editions. Knight does not give the note Wordsworth printed but cites the passages from Dorothy's journal on which the note was based.

poet was a serious reader of Roman historical writers and stoics, and that his philosophy was deeply stamped with Roman modes of thought. Like the Roman historians and biographers, he believed implicitly that liberty and good government are possible only where private virtues flourish. In his judgments on contemporary politics, he considered that he was guided by general principles rather than by considerations of expediency; and in his notorious shift from democratic to aristocratic views, Miss Worthington insists that it was not the principles that altered but Wordsworth's opinion as to the measures actually needed for securing the commonwealth against an "immoral" despotism. In his radical phase it was his faith in the virtue of the common people that led him to advocate a strictly democratic form of government. In his conservative phase, men of property had become for him the chief exponents of virtue, and it was "petty Artizans, Shop-keepers, and Pothouse Keepers" who represented the immediate menace to English liberties.

Miss Worthington does not suggest what personal factors may have contributed to bringing about this startling *volte-face*; she undertakes no critical analysis of the poet's basic assumptions in either period. It is not clear whether she realizes Wordsworth's extreme semantic naiveté in his use of words like "virtue" and "liberty"—his failure to work out the causal connections between virtue and, on the one hand, wealth and privilege, or, on the other, the moral state of men deprived of political rights and economic opportunity.

Much the most important part of Miss Worthington's study—and it is hardly too much to call it epoch-making in its bearings on Wordsworth's nature philosophy—is her demonstration of the close kinship, the practical identity, of the poet's cosmological system with that of Roman stoical philosophers like Cicero and Seneca, as they relate man's ethical reason with the essential nature and "active principle" of the universe. We are now able as never before to appreciate the systematic ethical philosophy underlying the "Ode to Duty," "The Character of the Happy Warrior," and other poems of his maturity; and new light is shed on the nature-philosophy of "The Prelude," and of "Tintern Abbey" and other poems of its period.

Miss Worthington does not mention the English intermediaries between the Roman moralists and Wordsworth, and she naturally ignores many features of the imaginative complex in which "nature" and "reason" are associated in his poems. But by sticking to the simple core of his philosophy, ethical and religious, she all the more effectively gives the *coup de grâce* to Irving Babbitt and his disciples—a tribe of critics to whom she does not once refer. Only gross ignorance of a great tradition, combined with anti-"romantic" bias, could explain their attempt to discredit Wordsworth's "naturalism" as being incompatible with a responsible

humanism. If, at this date, any reader should still think it a matter of importance to understand Wordsworth's philosophy, one thing he will have to take seriously into account is Miss Worthington's sober study, establishing as it does the close parallel between his thought and that of the Roman stoics.

JOSEPH WARREN BEACH

University of Minnesota

Newton Demands the Muse: Newton's "Opticks" and the Eighteenth Century Poets. By MARJORIE HOPE NICOLSON. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946. Pp. ix + 178. \$2.00. (*History of Ideas Series*, II.)

The history of scientific reputations probably offers no parallel to Newton's widespread vogue in early eighteenth-century England. A contemporary confidence in method had been stimulated by seventeenth-century mathematicism as a whole, and, by the turn of the century, lingered on in many fields. Newton's achievements, popularly viewed, seemed an exemplary *Discours de la Méthode*, and Thomson was not alone in equating him with "pure intelligence, whom God / To mortals lent to trace His boundless works." Fired by the symbol of Newton's name, Desaguliers could advance his engaging belief that the Newtonian system, "the best model of government," should be applied to political philosophy; while William Guthrie, in a burst of national pride, hoped that the rules of dramatic poetry now stand "upon the same footing with our noble system of Newtonian philosophy."

Newton was certainly affecting English poetry as a whole, though in different ways than Guthrie had in mind; and his influence, as Miss Nicolson shows, came largely through his great treatise on *Opticks* (1704). *Newton Demands the Muse*, which continues Miss Nicolson's suggestive studies of the effect of scientific discovery on literary imagination, discusses the nature of the *Opticks'* influence on English poetry during the thirty years following Newton's death in 1727, the period in which his English vogue was at its height. Her treatment of the subject, however, reveals broader implications which are relevant to English neo-classic poetry as a whole, and also to the aesthetic theory of the period.

After discussing the wide popular reception of the *Opticks*, Miss Nicolson outlines the ways in which Newton's theory of light and colors affected contemporary imagery, leading at times to a veritable "symbolism of the spectrum." Her outstanding example, in this as in other respects, is Thomson, in whom almost all the various strands of Newton's influence on English poetry seem to have

coalesced. Miss Nicolson next discusses the actual exposition of the physics of light in contemporary verse, particularly that of Blackmore, Brooke, Jago, John Reynolds, and Moses Browne. Miss Nicolson's subsequent chapters connect the influence of the *Opticks* with popular speculation on vision, outline the effect of Newton's discovery on aesthetic theory, and discuss the general metaphysical implications of his work. She touches suggestively, for example, on the rising interest during the eighteenth century in synaesthesia, or "harmony of the senses," and in brief space offers one of the few discussions of the subject which really augment or qualify the eighteenth-century material in Irving Babbitt's still standard *New Laokoon*. She also points out, in some detail, the contemporary association of light with the "sublime" and color with the "beautiful." The association may be accounted for in various ways. It had been implied in imagery of other periods, and is to some extent natural to human response. Again, so far as conscious awareness of the association is concerned, eighteenth-century aesthetic theory, on empirical and sensationalistic premises, was tending to equate the sublime with whatever imposed or aroused the strongest effect, whether through "excess" or "privation." Accordingly, while various sounds and colors might be considered "beautiful," extremes—such as loudness or silence, intense light or complete darkness—could be regarded as potentially "sublime." Miss Nicolson finds this tendency strongly accentuated by Newton's influence: light, for example, being associated with ethereal space, and the refraction of light into color possessing terrestrial connotation. The more general effect of the prismatic discovery of colors on aesthetics was simply to encourage the subjectivistic assumption that "mind alone," as Akenside said, contains within itself "The living fountain . . . Of beauteous and sublime." Yet this subjectivism was already creating a distrust of objective science, and others besides Hume were stressing the limitations of the human mind, with inevitable results to the triumphant symbol of Newton's name.

At the outset of her book, Miss Nicolson shows herself aware of the possible charge that she has "read more subtlety" into certain poets than they possessed. But I should be inclined to agree with her suspicion that "the oversubtlety is theirs rather than mine." Indeed, aside from fulfilling its general aim of illustrating a marked instance of the literary effect of scientific discovery, her book is particularly valuable in offering one more example of the firm mentality and fine, allusive complexity of early eighteenth-century poetic style: a complexity and mental strength to which the following century was often oblivious, but which, like certain other characteristics, indicate that neo-classicism rather than romanticism was the true heir of the late Renaissance.

W. J. BATE

Harvard University

Studies in Honor of A. H. R. Fairchild. Edited by CHARLES A. PROUTY. Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri Press, 1946. University of Missouri Studies, XXI, 1. Pp. 191. One plate. \$2.00.

There is an admirable preface, consisting of two sentences. The first reads: "It has seemed fitting to the colleagues, former students, and friends of Dr. A. H. R. Fairchild that the retirement of such a distinguished teacher and scholar should be signalized by a volume of studies." A second sentence acknowledges the indebtedness of the editor. Preceding this is a page containing a *Vita* and a list of Dr. Fairchild's publications. This practice is to be commended to all editors of *Festschriften*: it directs the attention to the intrinsic worth of the tributes, and it should be gratifying to the recipient of the honor in avoiding all eulogy of questionable taste.

Since Dr. Fairchild made his most significant contributions to the Shakespearean field, one expects emphasis upon this and closely related fields. Four of the articles deal with Shakespeare, a fifth with an Elizabethan text, one with the origin of the passion play, two with non-dramatic Elizabethan literature, and among the remaining four, one concerns Lamb's dramatic criticism.

The first article, "The Copyright of Shakespeare's Dramatic Works," by Dr. Giles E. Dawson, of the Folger Library, is the most important contribution to the volume. After three pages devoted to the rise of the idea of copyright the author leads the reader skillfully through a maze of detail relating to the ownership of copyright in separate plays as it affected the publication of the four folios. Nine pages representing painstaking research make possible two sentences of summary: "Separate plays and groups of plays passed from hand to hand by sale and bequest, and only the ownership of a large number of these entitled a man to initiate the publication of a collected edition. Ownership of even one play placed a man in an advantageous position for bargaining with the publishers of a proposed collection: he could insist upon his inclusion as one of the publishers or he could elect a cash payment instead." The account of collected editions in the eighteenth century centers in Tonson, his assumption of copyright, and the opposition of Walker, the Oxford Press, Cave, and Osburn. Scholars will have occasion to consult this article frequently.

They will also consult Dr. J. G. McManaway's study, "The Cancel in the Quarto in 2 Henry IV," dealing with the omission of III. i in the first copies and the correction. There are sound conjectures concerning the reasons for the omission and the process of correction. Dr. Harry R. Hoppe's contribution, "John of Bordeaux," a study of a manuscript having the characteristic marks of a bad quarto, also provides an example of the painstaking work in this country with texts and their transmission.

Although Dr. Alfred Westfall's account of the Baconian heresy is not a great contribution to scholarship, its comic spirit, "with no more flippancy than the subject warrants," makes excellent reading. The author proceeds from Joseph Hart and his bullfight, through Delia and Ignatius, Mrs. Gallup and Colonel Fabian, to Dr. Cunningham. It is perhaps the best cure of the disease to which the teacher can send the credulous student.

Dr. J. R. Moore's "The Character of Iago" is unconvincing. There is little point in asserting that "he has eaten supper across the officers' mess table from Iago," only to discover Iago's mediocrity as a soldier, his clumsiness as a plotter, and his stupidity, to boot. The method is questionable, and the character who emerges can hardly have been the agent of Othello's downfall.

Dr. Hardin Craig, in "The Origin of the Passion Play," entering the debate as to whether it was an outgrowth of the *Plautus Mariae*, deplores the general ignorance of mediaeval drama and takes occasion to reaffirm first principles, some of which have been clearly enunciated by Young. Dr. Craig is probably right in his vigorous protest against "hopeless confusion," but some readers may resent the tone, and particularly the implication that some scholars are as hopeless as freshmen who think that *1 Henry IV* must have been written before *1 Henry VI*.

The editor, Dr. Prouty, has added a study in the history of prose fiction, the relation of two tales by Whetstone and Grange to Gascoigne's *Adventures of Master F. J.* "How," he asks, "did the excellent narrative techniques and character portrayals of Gascoigne degenerate so quickly in his immediate successors?" In the answer Dr. Prouty attempts to estimate the literary purpose of both Whetstone and Grange.

Dr. Charles F. Mullett rounds out the Elizabethan studies with an account of Hugh Plat, a gentleman-virtuoso in the tradition of Bacon, whose inventions and observations, often more sound than those in Bacon's *Natural History*, make entertaining reading. Perhaps Dr. Mullett would find valuable cues for the estimate of Plat's originality by a careful comparison of his "discoveries" with contemporary documents.

Of the four remaining articles, that by Dr. Hyder Rollins, "Keats's Elgin Marbles Sonnets," substantiates the conjecture of J. M. Burnbull that Reynolds, not Haydon, wrote the *Champion* review of March 9, 1817. It is convincing. Dr. Edward H. Weatherby deals with a quarrel of Garrick and Churchill, and a reconciliation.

Dr. R. C. Bald's "Charles Lamb and the Elizabethans" finds in Lamb's criticism of Elizabethan drama "the influence of two tendencies usually thought of as characteristically mid-Victorian": moral earnestness and a certain squeamishness about matters of sex. It may be difficult for some of us to reconcile this interpretation of

the early Lamb with his vigorous defence of the a-moral atmosphere in which Restoration comedy should be seen.

The final article, "Steinbeck: Earth and Stars" by Dr. Woodburn Ross, attempts to isolate the ideas and attitudes that have given direction to Steinbeck's fiction. Some may agree with Dr. Ross that Steinbeck is objectifying his own unreconciled habits of thought, and others may conclude that Steinbeck, if he is a thinker, is a very confused one. Certainly, few will concur that the comparison with Comte is either striking or convincing.

MURRAY W. BUNDY

State College of Washington

Onze Poèmes de Rutebeuf concernant la croisade, publiés par JULIA BASTIN et EDMOND FARAL. (Documents relatifs à l'histoire des Croisades, publiés par l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, No. 1). Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1946. Pp. 145. 350 frs.

As a contribution to crusade history between 1254 and 1281, the Rutebeuf monograph issued by the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres represents excellent scholarship. As textual criticism, this study is less satisfactory. It should be remembered, however, that the sponsoring series is concerned more with the crusades than with editorial skill in Old French.

M. Faral has collected detailed and valuable information about the historical background for the eleven poems edited by Mlle Bastin. His thoroughly documented discussion has established the date for each poem with admirable precision, thereby correcting a half dozen errors in Bédier's chronology of twenty years ago (*Les Fabliaux*, p. 410); the dates proposed by Christian Dehm in his *Studien zu Rutebeuf* (Würzburg, 1935; pp. 14-15) are likewise superseded. M. Faral has analyzed the individual texts more convincingly than previous investigators of Rutebeuf: his argument for the essential unity in the *Complainte de Constantinople* is a striking example.

In a study focussed on the crusades it is not entirely surprising that comment on Rutebeuf is comparatively sketchy. It is surprising, nevertheless, that the "autobiographical" items in Rutebeuf's so-called personal poems are still accepted without reservation. Also, M. Faral does not mention the possibility that "Rutebeuf" may have been more than one individual; yet it is easy to suspect that poems 2, 8, 11 may not have been by the author of the other texts included in the edition. The monograph contains

no reference to the earlier Rutebeuf studies by Clédât, Denkinger, Feger, Keins, Leo, or Lucas.

A certain laconicism on the *Disputaison du croisé et du décroisé* implies a ready acceptance of the view that this poem was written by a crusade propagandist. To be sure, the editor recognizes the special "life and color" in the verses spoken by the "anti-crusader," but apparently the many parallels with the *Praedicatio sanctae Crucis* of Humbert de Romans have led M. Faral to discount what may well have been Rutebeuf's opposition to the French king's last expedition.

The monograph omits the dull *Complainte d'Anseau de Lille* and the more significant *Renart le Bestorné*. The latter poem, almost certainly an attack on the projected crusade of 1270, has long been classified among the Rutebeuf diatribes against the Mendicant Orders. M. Faral adheres to the latter explanation (cf. p. 33). In a University of Michigan monograph now in press, I am offering suggestions both about *Renart le Bestorné* and about the problem of multiple authorship within the Rutebeuf repertory.

Incidentally, M. Faral's comments on the preaching of the 1270 crusade (pp. 6-14, 53) imply that papal advocacy of the venture was interrupted only during Charles of Anjou's campaign for the Sicilian throne. Nothing is said of misgivings which prompted Clement IV to temper the zeal of Louis IX for a second journey to the Holy Land, and these reservations were already under discussion seventy years ago (cf. H. A. Wallon, *Saint Louis et son temps*, 2nd ed., II, 422).

Mlle Bastin has edited the eleven poems with more success than Jubinal or Kressner, but her texts contain over forty errors of transcription, further mistakes in the variants, needless elimination of inflectional "errors," and other vagaries in the details of emendation. Punctuation is often heavy, and diacritics follow no consistent pattern.

In a short notice, specific support of these opinions is limited to a few samples. Why no defense of C as basic manuscript? Why no explanation of criteria for emendation or conservation? Why no mention, for instance, of the many replacements of scribal *x* by editorial *us*? Why change *qui* ('if anyone') to *quæ* II-148? *Asseüre* II-157 is correctly translated in the glossary, but a note (p. 31) states that the meaning is not clear. Delete the period after II-159, and the semi-colon after II-167: the sense is at issue in both passages. As in many other verses, rhyme for the eye is not important enough to warrant changing (for example) *eigue* to *eive* v-71. Why change *delireuze* to *dolereuse* v-146? Why no reference (p. 76, n. 2) to x-128? The infinitives in VII-47 go with *s'en va* 44; the period after *detient* is wrong. Why no note on VII-108? For VII, 117-20, it would have been helpful if the editors had had access to the parallels cited in A. J. Creighton's 1944

edition of *Anticlaudian* (p. 152). By introducing a spelling with no support from either manuscript, the editor admits an extra syllable in VIII-62. The variant in VIII-78 is wrong; the text as edited follows C correctly. Manuscript C reads *teneiz* (not *tenés*) VIII-87. Disturbed by the rhyme *nos: -ons*, the editor accepts an ungainly phrase in VIII-146. The C reading *qui* (= *qu'il*) should be retained in IX-129. For the proverb in X-123, cf. also Morawski 2431 (and variants). For *sor noz piauz acroire* XI-30, cf. *Vie de sainte Elysabel* 249. In XI-116, I should prefer to read (cf. Clédât, *Rutebeuf*, p. 126): *En yver — et vos en jaleiz —*, thereby making the link more intelligible between *aleiz* 115 and *querre* 117. Why allow *veioir* XI-330 to stand, while emending *gaiaignier* VIII-98?

In XI-149 is *ce* necessarily correct? Note that C reads *se* and R *che*. In vv. 147-50, Mlle Bastin's punctuation is an apparent demurrer from that of Jubinal and Kressner, in the sense that they were wrong in inferring the dependence of v. 149 upon v. 148. Her text suggests that v. 149 means that "neither God nor your country have any respect for you," while the Jubinal-Kressner versions made the line into a conditional clause: "unless God or your country is proud of you (i. e., unless your moral and worldly reputation is good)." Without actual proof, I am inclined to agree with the earlier editions. At the same time, the pertinence of v. 150 in its particular location has not been explained or discussed: is it something more than an easy banality to complete a couplet in the leonine rhyme *-aïs*?

In XI-169 it is not enough to accept Tobler's hypothesis on *Gilemeir* (necessarily a proper noun?) without attempting to construe *tenu* 168 or to explain *couche* 171 (cf. Tobler-Lommatzsch II, 954, where the word is translated as "bed," but with a question-mark). Since non-committal comment in a review is more convenient for the critic than constructive for the reader, the following very tentative translation is proposed for vv. 168-72: "You are bedside knights (although nothing more) because otherwise (cf. the R variant) you would be classed among Gilemeir's lineage and because you do have a little fear of criticism, but not because of any real wish or conscience of your own." This rendering, however, invites two further queries: are Jubinal and Kressner wrong in printing v. 167 without any punctuation, and does the conjunction at the beginning of v. 171 represent Latin *sic* or *si*? In any case, it is fairly certain, whatever the sense of *Gilemeir* originally, that *parentei a Gilemeir* connotes "shirkers in general." Also, it seems impossible not to regard *que* 172 as causal.

The presence of numerous common words in the glossary makes it only the more regrettable that the following have been omitted:

abaier IV-60, *balance* IV-12, *couche* XI-171, *deduist* XI-239, *efforcement* III-18, *estandars* I-140, *mener en destre* X-28, *meniere* VI-38, *metre ariere* VI-43, *piece* VII-114, *pietaille* XI-162, *prestei* III-17, *same* IV-34, *secorre* XI-106, *tenu de* XI-168.

Neither the glossary nor the note on p. 62 explain the expression *patrimoine au Crucefi*: under war-time conditions, the editors were probably unaware of the long note by A. Långfors in *Neuphilologische Mittheilungen* XLVI (1945), 115-122, where the word *Crucefi* is identified with Christ instead of with the crucifix.

EDWARD B. HAM

University of Michigan

Georges Ascoli. Par HENRI CHAMARD. *L'Education nationale*, 20 juin 1946. Pp. 4.

As his American friends have found it difficult to secure information about the fate of Georges Ascoli, I would call attention to this touching tribute, written by one who had been both his teacher and his colleague.

Born at Paris on June 14, 1882, Ascoli entered the Ecole Normale, became an *agrégé* in 1907, taught in several provincial lycées and, in 1919-29, at the University of Lille. He obtained the doctorate in 1930. In October of that year he became *maître de conférences* at the Sorbonne, where he was given in 1935 the chair of French literary history in the nineteenth century.

In the First World War he rose to the rank of *chef de bataillon*, was three times wounded and five times cited for bravery. In the Second World War he served as lieutenant-colonel until he was captured on June 17, 1940. While a prisoner at Nuremberg he organized for his fellow captives a university of which he was rector. Released in August, 1941, he was allowed to return to his home at Sèvres, but he was excluded from his professorship by the Vichy government and was not allowed even to enter a public library. Thanks, however, to the friendship of M. Bonnerot, he was able to work as a collaborator in the edition of Sainte-Beuve's correspondence. On Feb. 19, 1944, only six months before the liberation of Paris, he and his wife were arrested by the Gestapo for the crime of being Jews, were taken to Silesia, and in March were sent to "la chambre à gaz et le four crématoire."

I have just learned from his son, Pierre, that the Nazis, not satisfied with this act of unpardonable brutality, also sought to blot out his labors as a scholar. They ransacked his villa at Sèvres, stole or destroyed a book on Victor Hugo that was almost ready for publication, a study of *Micromégas*, and an elaborate collection of *fiches*. They could not, however, do away with the various articles he had written, including what he wrote for the *Histoire de la littérature française* of Bédier et Hazard, or the books that constitute his greatest contribution to literary history: his critical edition of Zadiq, his *Grande-Bretagne devant l'opinion française depuis la*

guerre de cent ans jusqu'à la fin du XVI^e siècle (360 pp.), and his two-volume *Grande-Bretagne devant l'opinion française au XVII^e siècle* (885 pp.), a monumental work that will keep his memory fresh long after his executioners have been forgotten.

And we shall remember him as Chamard describes him:

ce Français, ardent et ferme patriote, qui fut toute sa vie un homme de devoir, et qui toujours, dans les diverses circonstances où le plaça la destinée, sut allier à tous les dons de la plus vive intelligence les plus belles vertus civiles et morales.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

Ned Ward of Grubstreet: A Study of Sub-Literary London in the Eighteenth Century. By HOWARD WILLIAM TROYER. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946. Pp. xi + 290. \$3.50.

This is a first-rate book about a third-rate author. It is discriminating, scholarly, complete, and—what is more unusual—very well written. It is the only full-length book about Ward, indeed the only account of any sort since Aitken's able but inaccurate sketch in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. It is a book that scholars interested in the by-ways of eighteenth-century literary and social history have long needed.

The body of the book consists of a chronological account of Ward's life and writings. The mass of rumor, gossip, and genuine information about Ward's life is judiciously sifted, and several new facts are brought forth. We now know, for example, that Ward did not set up as the proprietor of a public house until 1712, and that he never owned or operated the King's Head Tavern in Fulwood's Rents next door to Gray's Inn. We know that he did not visit New England. We know more precisely the nature of the rôle he played in the affair of Partridge the astrologer, and we know the full story of his relations with Alexander Pope. This story, narrated from Ward's point of view, gives us fresh insight into Pope's unscrupulous satirical methods, and a good deal of sympathy for Ward.

Professor Troyer argues convincingly, yet without straining the point, that Ward played a more significant part in the development of English journalism than is usually assigned to him. In other respects his view of Ward is the conventional one. He portrays him as a vigorous but vulgar wit, a hot-brained political pamphleteer, an observer of men's manners, not their souls, a biased reporter who chose to see only what was sordid, cruel, and vicious in the narrow world about him. His works survive today, in so far as they survive at all, as source books for social historians, rather than as monuments of eighteenth-century literature. The frequent quotations

which Professor Troyer sprinkles through his book are well chosen and useful, for most of Ward's writings are inaccessible to the general reader today. An exception is *The London Spy*, which was twice reprinted in the 1920's.

The most famous of Ward's works in his own day were *A Trip to Jamaica* and *The London Spy*. Others that had an enduring vogue were *The Secret History of the Calves-Head Club*, *Female Policy Detected*, and *The Wooden World Dissected*. The last two of these, we learn from Professor Troyer's definitive 50-page bibliography, were still being reprinted a century after their first appearance. Such popularity is a tribute to Ward's success in giving the public what it wanted; but it is also a commentary on the public's taste. For in the final analysis, Ward really deserved Pope's climactic sneer:

Another Durfey, Ward! shall sing in thee.

CYRUS L. DAY

University of Delaware

BRIEF MENTION

Columbia Dictionary of Modern European Literature. HORATIO SMITH, General Editor. New York: Columbia University Press, 1947. Pp. xvi + 899. \$10.00. *Dictionary* means 'encyclopedia.' *Modern* means 'from Baudelaire to the present,' excluding Hugo. *European* includes Iceland and Turkey, but not Great Britain and Ireland. *Literature* is extended to take in the work of certain critics, literary historians, and philologists (Doumic, Lanson, Asín Palacios), but not others (Villey, Vossler, Paul Meyer).¹ Many literary historians and philologists, indeed, have a better right to be listed than some who appear. Nor is the standard of inclusion the same for different disciplines. The articles contain critical appraisal as well as biographical and bibliographical information. As they were composed by 239 scholars,² distinguished and undistinguished, the commentaries necessarily vary in length and in value, but the book will be useful, for it contains a vast amount of information difficult to find elsewhere on short notice. The general editor had completed his work on the volume before his untimely death on Sept. 9, 1946. He deserves great credit for organizing such an

¹ It was he, as well as Gaston Paris, who founded *Romania*; cf. p. 609.

² These are listed after the preface in alphabetical order, according to their first names, not their last—a method employed, as I have been told, in Brazilian telephone-books. By consulting this list one can easily discover who wrote a certain article, but not what article or articles a certain person wrote.

undertaking, for the labor he expended in selecting the 239 and, with their help, the 1167 subjects, as well as for keeping his battalion of writers in sufficient awareness of limitations in space and time to produce what is, on the whole, a valuable collection of articles. It is a book that no self-respecting library can do without.

H. C. L.

The World of Learning, with an Introduction [1 page] by Dr. GILBERT MURRAY. London: Europa Publications Limited, 1947. Pp. iv + 520. £3. It is hard to keep up with nomads. *Minerva* made an attempt for many years; the *Index Generalis*, briefly. The British are now replacing them. This first edition represents the situation more or less, at least in America, as it was in the academic year 1945-6. It lists universities with their rectors or presidents, their deans and professors; learned societies; libraries and museums; technical schools and colleges. The publishers admit that their work is incomplete and "not as up-to-date" as they would have wished. They mark with an asterisk European institutions of which the lists, on account of post-war conditions, could not be revised. In response to their request for suggestions I make the following comments. Among the institutions of higher learning in the United States I note the absence of the Institute for Advanced Study and with it the name of Albert Einstein. Among libraries there is no mention of the New York Public, the Boston Public, or the Peabody (Baltimore). No mention is made of the University of Algiers. At times professors are not listed unless they hold administrative posts (Rutgers, Syracuse, Washington University, etc.). Retired professors are not listed. There is no index, a most unfortunate omission. The American Philosophical Society should be put, not under "Philosophy and Psychology" (p. 407), but under "General" (p. 403). It is misleading, not to say amusing, to discover such distinguished institutions as the Collège de France, the Ecole des Beaux Arts, and the Ecole du Louvre under the heading, "National High Schools and Colleges." Only thirteen American colleges are mentioned with any detail. The others listed, and with them some universities, are given about as in the *World Almanac*. Yet the Catholic University, Rice, Vanderbilt, Lehigh, Clark, Oberlin, Swarthmore, Haverford, Mt. Holyoke, Wesleyan, and Williams might well claim the consideration assigned to Mary Washington or the North Dakota Agricultural College. However, despite its deficiencies, the book will often prove helpful. Until an improved edition appears, it may well be an essential work for scholars and for those who wish to consult them.

H. C. L.

Eugenia De Acton: 1749-1827. By ELIZA PEARL SHIPPEN. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 1945. Pp. x + 180. It is hard to conceive why such a task as this should have been chosen, and still harder to understand why a learned body should have accepted the subject as worthy of serious investigation. It is the kind of so-called research which furnishes ammunition to the despisers of graduate study, and lends support to their false but dangerous charges that research has come to mean "more and more about less and less." A lesser author than Eugenia De Acton would be hard to find. She was a middle-aged sentimental moralizer, who spun out two volumes of vague essays, and five dreary novels which were cheap imitations of Richardson and Mrs. Radcliffe. Her work was shallow, prolix, and dull; it had scarcely any intellectual significance or artistic merit. Even those hack-reviewers of her day who tried to say something agreeable about everybody, were hard put to it to find anything in her novels that was not either commonplace or contemptible. Nor has Miss Shippen, despite earnest efforts, succeeded in doing so. When Oblivion has mercifully covered such banalities as Eugenia De Acton's, it seems a disservice to enlightenment to try to resurrect them. Each generation produces so much trashy literature of its own that it is unnecessary to drag forgotten rubbish out of the musty recesses of the past.

University of Illinois

ERNEST BERNBAUM

The Moral Poetry of Pope. By GEOFFREY TILLOTSON. Published by The Literary and Philosophical Society of Newcastle upon Tyne, 1946. (The Robert Spence Watson Memorial Lecture for 1945.) Pp. 32. Professor Tillotson, whose work in the Twickenham Edition of Pope's poems admirably illuminated some of Pope's best imaginative work, shows a similar insight in this valuable lecture concerning the poet's didactic poems, especially *An Essay on Man*. On the two chief problems discussed—the relation of a poet's personality to the sincerity of his doctrine and the relation of didacticism to poetry—Tillotson is a sound and sympathetic guide. The mid-twentieth century, thanks to Tillotson and others like him, will go down in history as perceiving—as the nineteenth century did not always do—that poetry speaks to the emotions, the imagination, and to the intellect. It embodies a voice speaking to total consciousness, not to a specialized part of consciousness. In its "perfected utterance"—which is its essence—intellect cannot be left out. It is this fact that makes for a juster conception of the work not of Pope merely but of the whole art of poetry. Tillotson's lecture will be highly valued by all who wish to savor the finer qualities of Pope—and of poetry.

Harvard University

GEORGE SHERBURN

The Dynamics of Literature. By NATHAN COMFORT STARR. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945. Pp. viii + 123. Mr. Starr's little book claims to "develop the faculty of making judgments about literature," to "reaffirm certain basic principles" and to spend "some time in close analysis of words, their implications and overtones." (vii) Actually we are given a set of incoherent lectures filled with platitudes and uplift, devoid of any critical scheme and even of moderate skill in close analysis. The level of taste is indicated by favorable references to Kenneth Roberts and Russell Davenport and by plaintive incomprehension for Joyce, Auden and even Conrad and Sterne. The style abounds in metaphors of a sort: we are to "penetrate vertically to the heart of the work" (17), we are to "hold to the good while still it stands before the tooth of time" (49). In practice, we are told little more than that a reader should re-create literature and that an author should "bring an ardent faith in the dignity of man as man" (115). It is difficult to see to what audience this book could be addressed and why a reputable University Press should publish a book so completely out of touch with modern aesthetics and critical theory.

RENÉ WELLEK

Yale University

CORRESPONDENCE

MEDIAEVAL AND RENAISSANCE LATIN TRANSLATIONS AND COMMENTARIES.

A new cooperative project for the preparation of annotated lists and guides of mediaeval and Renaissance Latin translations and commentaries is now in progress. The work when completed will list Latin translations to 1600 of Greek authors who wrote before A. D. 600; and Latin commentaries to 1600 on Greek and Latin authors who wrote before A. D. 1600. Inquiries regarding the project may be directed to any member of the Editorial Board: R. J. Clements (Harvard); Dean M. E. Cosenza (Brooklyn College); J. Hutton (Cornell); P. Kibre (Hunter College); P. O. Kristeller (Columbia); D. P. Lockwood (Haverford); Dean M. R. P. McGuire (Catholic Univ. of America); B. Marti (Bryn Mawr); R. V. Merrill (Univ. of Calif., Los Angeles); E. M. Sanford (Sweet Briar); J. J. Savage (Fordham); J. R. Strayer (Princeton); A. Taylor (Univ. of Calif., Berkeley); S. H. Thomson (Univ. of Colorado); and B. L. Ullman (Univ. of N. Carolina).

PEARL KIBRE

Hunter College

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Allen, James G.—Editorial opinion in the contemporary British Commonwealth and the Empire. *Boulder, Colorado*: Univ. of Col. Press, 1946. Pp. xxii + 297-605. \$1.00. (University of Colorado Studies. Series C. Vol. 1, No. 4).

Astrov, Margot, ed.—The winged serpent: an anthology of American Indian prose and poetry. *New York*: John Day, 1946. Pp. 366. \$3.50.

Bax, Clifford, ed.—Letters and poems of Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots. *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1947. Pp. 71. \$2.25.

Chaucer, Geoffrey—Contes de Cantorbéry. Contes choisis avec introduction grammaticale, notes et glossaire par Joseph Delecourt. *Paris*: Aubier, 1946. Pp. 329. (Bibliothèque de Philologie Germanique, x).

Clark, H. H. and Foerster, N., eds.—James Russell Lowell. *New York*: American Book Co., 1947. Pp. clxvi + 498.

Coker, Robert E., ed.—Research and regional welfare. Papers presented at a conference on research at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, May 9-10-11, 1945. With a foreword by Louis R. Wilson. *Chapel Hill*: Univ. of N. C. Press, 1946. Pp. xvi + 229. \$3.00.

Fadiman, Clifton, ed.—The collected writings of Ambrose Bierce. *New York*: The Citadel Press, 1946. Pp. xix + 810.

Foerster, Donald M.—Homer in English criticism: the historical approach in the eighteenth century. *New Haven*: Yale Univ. Press, 1947. Pp. vi + 133. \$3.00. (Yale Studies in English, Volume 105).

Frye, Northrop—Fearful symmetry: a study of William Blake. *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton Univ. Press, 1947. Pp. 462. Seven plates. \$5.00.

Great Britain: British Museum—Coleridge: an excerpt from the general catalogue of printed books. *London*: Clowes & Sons, 1947. Pp. 19. 3/6.

Greenough, C. N.—A bibliography of the Theophrastian character in English. Prepared for publication by J. Milton French. *Cambridge*: HUP, 1947. Pp. xii + 347. \$10.00.

Leopold, Werner F.—Speech development of a bilingual child: a linguist's record. Volume II (Sound-learning in the first two years). *Evanston, Ill.*: Northwestern Univ., 1947. Pp. xi + 295. \$5.50. (Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities, No. 11).

Matthiessen, F. O., ed.—The American novels and stories of Henry James. *New York*: Knopf, 1947. Pp. xxvii + 933. \$5.00.

Osgood, C. G., Lotspeich, H. G., and Mason, Dorothy, eds.—The works of Edmund Spenser: A variorum edition. The minor poems, II. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1947. Pp. xii + 745. \$8.50.

Paine, Gregory, ed.—Southern prose writers. *New York*: American Book Co., 1947. Pp. cxlv + 392.

Rogers, Elizabeth F., ed.—The correspondence of Sir Thomas More. *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton Univ. Press, 1947. Pp. xxii + 584. Five plates. \$7.50.

Shaw, G. B.—Back to Methuselah: a meta-biological Pentateuch. Revised edition with a postscript. *New York and London*: OUP, 1947. Pp. lxxiv + 261. \$1.50.

Styles, Philip and Bloer, J. W.—The borough of Stratford-upon-Avon and the parish of Alveston. *London and New York*: OUP, 1946. Pp. 72. Ten plates. \$5.00. (Reprinted from The Victoria county history of Warwickshire, 1945, III).

Taft, Kendall B., ed.—Minor Knickerbockers. *New York*: American Book Co., 1947. Pp. cxlviii + 410.

Withycombe, E. G.—The Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names. *New York and London*: OUP, 1947. Pp. xxxviii + 142. \$3.00.

Zeiger, Arthur, ed.—Selected novels of Henry James. *New York*: Caxton House, 1946. Pp. xi + 572. \$2.50.

GERMAN

Bühlig, Marga.—Hebbels dramatischer Stil [Wege zur Dichtung. 35] *Frauenfeld*: 1940. 116 pp.

Güttinger, Fritz.—Die romantische Komödie und das deutsche Lustspiel [Wege zur Dichtung, 34]. *Frauenfeld*: 1939. 273 pp.

Meier, Georg Friedrich.—Thoughts on Jestling Translated in the Year 1764 from the Second German Edition of a Work by Georg Friedrich Meier of The University of Halle: Now Edited with Introduction and Notes by Joseph Jones of the University of Texas. *Austin*: The Univ. of Texas Press, 1947. 5 leaves, xi + 136 pp. \$1.50.

Wehrli, Ené.—Eichendorffs Erlebnis und die Gestaltung der Sinnenwelt [Wege zur Dichtung 32]. *Frauenfeld*: 1938. 279 pp.

FRENCH

Balzac.—Le Cousin Pons, éd. Camille Meyer. *Paris*: Eds. Diderot, 1946. xvi + 217 pp. Fr. 250.

— Le Lys dans la vallée, éd. R. Mayer. *Paris*: Simon (1946). 287 pp. Fr. 50.

- Le Médecin de campagne, éd. Roger Joxe. *Lille*: S. I. L. I. C., 1945. 324 pp. Fr. 90.
- La Peau de chagrin, éd. Georges Eudes. *Paris*: Eds. de la vie réelle, 1946. vi + 220 pp. Fr. 2200.
- Barrière, Pierre. — Un grand provincial: Charles-Louis de Secondat, baron de La Brède et de Montesquieu. *Bordeaux*: Delmas, 1946. xvi + 551 pp. Fr. 400.
- Boileau. — L'Art poétique, éd. Philippe Van Tieghem. *Paris*: Eds. Diderot, 1946. 51 pp. Fr. 18.
- Bordeaux, Henry. — L'Académie française en 1914, histoire d'une candidature. *Paris*: Eds. d'histoire et d'art, 1946. 88 pp. Fr. 200.
- Brantôme. — Vies de dames galantes, éd. René-Louis Doyon. *Paris*: Rasmussen, 1946. 242 pp.
- Brenner, Clarence D. — Dramatizations of French Short Stories in the Eighteenth Century with special reference to the "Contes" of La Fontaine, Marmontel, and Voltaire. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1947. 33 pp. (U. of Cal. Pubs. in Mod. Phil., XXXIII, no. 1.)
- Brotherton, F. F. — Les Aventures de Maître Renart et de ses Compères. *Glasgow*: Blackie, 1946. 1/5.
- Buet, Patrice. — La Farce de Maître Pathelin, rôles masculins, d'après la farce du XV^e siècle. *Paris*: Billaudot (1946). 52 pp. Fr. 27.
- Chateaubriand. — Atala. René. Ed. Camille Augier. *Paris*: Eds. Diderot, 1946. 115 pp. Fr. 24.
- Constant, Benjamin. — Adolphe, présenté par Fernand Perdril. *Lyons*: I. A. C., 1946. xlv + 125 pp. Fr. 24.
- Destaing, J., M. Hervent, P. Vaille, L. Maste. — Nouvelle poésie épique de la France, petite anthologie des poètes de la Résistance. *Singen*: Ed. du Haute-Bade (1946). 46 pp.
- Duclos, Jacques et Jean Fréville. — Henri Barbusse. *Paris*: Eds. sociales, 1946. 72 pp. Fr. 27.
- Ducray, Camille. — Gérard de Nerval. *Paris*: Tallandier, 1946. 303 pp. Fr. 100.
- Duval, Pierre. — Style et syntaxe. *Strasbourg*: Heitz (1946). 87 pp. Fr. 30.
- Flaubert. — Trois Contes, éd. René-Louis Doyon. *Paris*: Rasmussen, 1946. 230 pp. Fr. 55.
- Giraud, Victor. — La Critique littéraire, le problème, les théories, les méthodes. *Paris*: Aubier, 1946. 208 pp. Fr. 135.
- Guérin, Charles. — Recueil de pages françaises. XVI^e siècle. *Paris*: Elites françaises, 1946. xxxi + 349 pp. Fr. 165.
- Guillemin, Henri. — Lamartine et la question sociale. *Paris*: Plon, 1946. i + 221 pp. Fr. 75.
- Gutmann, René-Albert. — Introduction à la lecture des poètes français. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1946. 302 pp. Fr. 150.
- Haedens, K. — Une Histoire de la littérature française. *Montreal*: Eds. Variétés, 1946. 460 pp. \$2.25.
- Hemmer, Danielle (ed.). — Anthologie des femmes poètes contemporains. *Paris*: Cahiers de France, 1939. 144 pp. Fr. 100.
- Henriot, Emile. — Poètes français. II. De Lamartine à Valéry. *Lyons*: Lardanchet, 1946. 394 pp. Fr. 180.
- Léautaud, Paul. — Choix de pages, éd. André Rouveyre. *Paris*: Eds. du Béliet, 1946. 367 pp.
- Ledesert, R. P. L. et D. M. — Histoire de la littérature française. I. *London*: Arnold, 1946. 295 pp. 6/6.
- Le Maître, H. — Essai sur le mythe de Psyché dans la littérature française des origines à 1890. *Paris*: Boivin (1946). vi + 391 pp. Fr. 300.
- Lorenz, Paul. — Le Tombeau de Paul Valéry. *Paris*: Méridien, 1946. 29 pp. Fr. 100.
- Marivaux. — Le Jeu de l'amour et du hasard, éd. Paul Dufac. *Paris*: Eds. Diderot, 1946. 99 pp. Fr. 24.
- Martin-Saint-René, A. Fergy, etc. — Etudes poétiques, 1945-6. *Paris*: Bibliothèque des Etudes poétiques, 1946. 47 pp. Fr. 30.
- Mérimée, Prosper. — Théâtre de Clara Gazul. Présentation par Jean Cassou. *Paris*: Eds. nationales, 1946. xv + 261 pp. Fr. 4800.
- Molière. — La Critique de l'Ecole des femmes, l'Impromptu de Versailles, éd. Paul Dubois. *Paris*: Eds. Diderot, 1946. 95 pp. Fr. 24.
- Le Malade imaginaire, éd. Louis-G. Foissac. *Paris*: Eds. Diderot, 1946. 120 pp.
- Les Précieuses ridicules, éd. Hugues Marin. *Paris*: Eds. Diderot, 1946. 64 pp. Fr. 18.
- Théâtre de 1666 à 1668, éd. H. de Bouillane de Lacoste. *Paris*: Belles-Lettres, 1946. 372 pp. Fr. 160.
- Paul-Crouzet, Jeanne. — Poésie au Canada, de nouveaux classiques français. *Paris*: Didier, 1946. 373 pp. Fr. 300.
- Pillement, Georges. — Anthologie du théâtre français contemporain. II. Le Théâtre du Boulevard. *Paris*: Eds. du Béliet, 1946. 485 pp. Fr. 450.
- Racine. — Bajazet, éd. Gabriel Ménard. *Paris*: Eds. Diderot, 1946. 87 pp. Fr. 24.
- Britannicus, éd. Emile Ripert. *Ibid.*, 1946. 107 pp. Fr. 24.
- Esther, éd. L. Froissac. *Ibid.*, 1946. 71 pp. Fr. 24.
- Rastier, André. — Victor Hugo et l'amour. *Lyons*: Klein, 1946. 32 pp. Fr. 15.

Richard, Noël.—Louis le Cardonnell et les revues symbolistes. *Paris*: Didier, 1946. 174 pp. Fr. 250.

Ronsard.—Œuvres complètes, éd. Paul Lamonnier, T. XI, XII. *Paris*: Didier, 1946. Fr. 260.

Rousseau, J.-J.—Julie ou la Nouvelle Héloïse, extraits, éd. Etienne Lefèvre. *Paris*: Eds. Diderot, 1946. 135 pp. Fr. 24.

—Les Rêveries d'un promeneur solitaire, éd. R.-L. Doyon. *Paris*: Rasmussen, 1946. 220 pp. Fr. 55.

Rutebeuf.—Onze poèmes concernant la Croisade, éd. Julia Bastin et Edmond Faral. *Paris*: Geuthner, 1946. 147 pp. Fr. 350.

Samain et Jammes.—Une amitié lyrique. Correspondance inédite. Introd. et notes de Jules Mouquet. *Paris*: Emile-Paul frères, 1945. 198 pp. Fr. 80.

Senancour, E. de.—Rêveries sur la nature primitive de l'homme. T. II par G. Saintville. *Paris*: Droz, 1940. xx + 193 pp. (Soc. des textes fr. modernes.)

Sherrington, Sir C.—The Endeavor of Jean Fernel, with list of the editions of his writings. *London*: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1946. x + 244 pp.

Stendhal.—Chroniques italiennes. éd. Pierre Jourda. *Paris*: Eds. Diderot, 1946. 238 pp. Fr. 250.

—Le Rouge et le noir, éd. André Ferran. 2v. *Paris*: Vautrain, 1946. Fr. 296.

Talamon, B. et R.—Entendu en France. *New York*: Crofts, 1947. x + 203 pp. \$1.75.

Tristan l'Hermite.—Le Page disgracié, éd. Marcel Arland. *Paris*: Delamain et Bouctelleau, 1946. 325 pp. Fr. 180.

Veran, Jules.—Les Poétesses provençales du Moyen âge et de nos jours. *Paris*: Quillet (1946). xxiv + 309 pp.

Weiman, R. W.—Living Conversation Manual, French. *New York*: Crown, 1946. 134 pp. \$3.00.

Wordsworth, C. W.—Modern French Syntax and Composition. *New York*: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1946. xii + 344 pp. 6/.

ITALIAN

Alighieri, D.—Monarchia. Versione col testo a fronte. Introd. e commento di A. C. Volpe. *Modena*: Soc. Tip. Modenese, 1946. 204 pp. L. 500.

Apollonio, M.—Storia del teatro italiano. Vol. III. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1946. 458 pp. L. 500.

Battaglia, F.—Impero, Chiesa e Stati particolari nel pensiero di Dante. *Bologna*: Zanichelli, 1944. 142 pp. L. 120.

Evola, N. D.—Appunti di bibliografia. *Palermo*: Palumbo, 1946. 112 pp. L. 180.

Fumagalli, G.—Chi l'ha detto? *Milano*: Hoepli, 1946. xviii + 842 pp. L. 500.

Gaetani, S.—Bernardo Bellincioni. *Galatina*: a cura degli Amici del Libro, 1945-46. 92 pp. L. 90.

Postiglione, P.—Riflessi dell'Inferno Dantesco. *Napoli*: Guida, 1946. 70 pp. L. 140.

Rizzo, T. L.—Manuale per lo studio critico della letteratura italiana. *Palermo*: Palumbo, 1946. 196 pp. L. 300.

Romagnoli, U.—I Medici. *Bologna*: Cappelli, 1946. 310 pp. L. 100.

Sacchetti, Franco.—Il Trecentonovelle. A cura di V. Pernicone. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1946. xxiv + 614 pp. L. 650.

Sander, M.—Le Livre à figures italien depuis 1467 jusqu'à 1530. *Milano*: Hoepli, s. d. 5 vols. L. 35,000.

Vallone, A.—Bibliografia critica del romanzo e dei romanzieri dalla Scapigliatura all'Ermetismo. (Parte generale e lett. A. B.) Prima puntata. *Galatina*: a cura degli Amici del libro, 1945-46. 168 pp. L. 200.

Violi, F.—Saggio di un dizionario toponomastico della pianura modenese. *Modena*: Soc. tip. modenese, 1946. 72 pp. L. 200.

SPANISH

Besso, H. V.—Temas de Conversación sobre las Américas. *New York*: Hastings House, 1946. xxviii + 255 pp. \$2.75.

Bocángel y Unzueta, Gabriel.—Obras, ed. R. Benítez Clarós. *Madrid*: Inst. "Nicolás Antonio," 1946. xvii + 425 pp.

Cardenal Gracheta, Manuel.—Libro de la erudición poética de Don Luis Carrillo y Sotomayor. *Madrid*: Inst. "Nicolás Antonio," 1946. xvi + 138 pp.

Delgado, Alejandro.—Memorias de un Aventurero. Viaje al Oriente Peruano. *Lima*: 1946. 79 pp.

Del Río, Amalia A. de, and E. H. Hespelt.—Lecturas hispánicas. I. *New York*: Dryden Press, 1946. viii + 248 pp. \$1.80.

Donoso, Ricardo.—Estudios de historia política y literaria. *Santiago*: Univ. de Chile, 1945. 223 pp.

García de Diego, Vicente.—Manual de Diactología Española. *Madrid*: Inst. de Cultura Hispánica, 1946. 324 pp.

González Palencia, Angel.—Del "Lazarillo" a Quevedo. Estudios histórico-literarios. *Madrid*: Inst. "A. de Nebrija," 1946. viii + 430 pp.

Leslie, J. K.—Spanish for Conversation; a beginning grammar. *Boston*: Ginn, 1947. xi + 322 pp. \$2.25.

López Núñez, Juan.—"Don Juan Tenorio" en el Teatro, la Novela y la Poesía. *Madrid*: Prensa Castellana, 1946. 166 pp.

Miró, Rodrigo.—La literatura panameña. Breve recuento histórico. *Panama*: 1946. 12 pp.

Nykl, A. R.—Hispano-Arabie Poetry and Its Relation with the Old Provençal Troubadours. *Baltimore*: J. H. Furst, 1946. xxvii + 416 pp. \$10.00.

Placencia, A. R.—Antología poética. Introd. de A. G. Hermosillo. *Mexico*: Univ. Nacional, 1946. 212 pp.

Prudencio Clemente, Aurelio.—Himnos a los mártires, ed. M. José Bayo. *Madrid*: Inst. "A. de Nebrija," 1946. 242 pp.

Romera-Navarro, Miguel.—Estudio del autógrafo de "El Héroe" Graciano. *Madrid*: Inst. "A. de Nebrija," 1946. 232 pp.

Terradas, Esteban.—Neologismos, arcaísmos y sinónimos en plática de ingenieros. *Madrid*: Real Acad. Esp. (1946). 298 pp.

Valera, Juan y Menéndez Pelayo.—Epistolario, 1877-1905, ed. M. Artigas Ferrando y P. Sáinz Rodríguez. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe (1946). 620 pp.

Wallenberg, Ernst.—1000 Words and Phrases: A Pleasant Way into Spanish. *New York*: Essential Books, 1945. 254 pp. \$2.50.

Weiman, R. W. and O. A. Succar.—Living Language Conversation Manual, Spanish. *New York*: Crown, 1946. 119 pp. \$3.00.

PORTUGUESE

King, E. F. and A. da R. Prista.—Lições de composição portuguesa. *Syracuse*: Syracuse U. Bookstore, 1946. v + 89 pp. mimeographed.

Lincoln, J. N.—Charts of Brazilian Literature. *Ann Arbor*: Edwards Bros., 1947. x + 86 pp.

Simões dos Reis, A.—Bibliografia da "Hist. da Lit. Brasileira" de Silvio Romero. I. *Rio de Janeiro*: Olympio, 1943. 286 pp.

Soares, A. J. de M.—Estudos lexicográficos do dialeto brasileiro. *Rio de Janeiro*: Revista do Inst. hist. e geográf. brasileiro, 1942. 264 pp.

Töpker, H. W.—A língua portuguesa para estrangeiros. *São Paulo*: Melhoramentos, 1944. 342 pp.

Vasconcelos, N. S. de.—Pequeno dicionário inglês-português. *São Paulo*: Ed. Nacional, 1943. 376 pp.

Vieira, Hermes.—Vicente de Carvalho. O sabiá da Ilha do Sol. Bio-crítica, ed. F. L. Ribeiro. *São Paulo*: Autor, 1944. 297 pp.

Viotti, Manuel.—Dicionário da Gíria Brasileira. *São Paulo*: Edit. Universitária, 1945. xii + 372 pp.

RUSSIAN

Boianus, S. K.—Russian Conversational Narratives. 2 v. *London*: Sidgwick, 1943. 47. 104 + 85 pp. 19 s.

Chernuchin, I.—Rus.-Eng. Technical and Scientific Dict. *London*: Int. Univs. Press, 1944. \$10.00.

Gogol, N. V.—The Inspector-General. Bondar's Russian Readers. *London*: Pitman, 1946. 156 pp. 5 s.

Gourfinkel, Nina.—Tolstoï sans tolstoïsme. *Paris*: Eds. du Seuil, 1946. 189 pp. Fr. 90.

Herzfeld, K. M., and Others.—Eng.-Rus. Dict. of Chemistry. *London*: Collet, 1944. 504 pp. 15 s.

Hofmann, M.—Histoire de la littérature russe. *Paris*: Eds. du Chêne, 1946. 256 pp. Fr. 150.

Ibarra, Fr. and N. W. Orloff.—Modern Russian self-taught. *Toronto*: Random House, 1947. viii + 337 pp. \$3.00.

Lavrin, J.—An Introduction to the Russian Novel. *London*: Methuen, 1946. 216 pp. 7/6.

Lavrin, Janko (ed.).—Russian Humorous Stories (Pushkin and Others). *London*: Sylvan Press, 1946. 208 pp. 6 d.

—Russian Stories: Pushkin to Gorky. *London*: Westhouse, 1946. 239 pp.

Moore, E. A. and G. Struve.—Practical Russian. Bk. I. *London*: Arnold, 1946. 122 pp. 5 s.

Moore, E. A., and G. Struve.—Practical Russian. *New York*: Longmans, 1946. \$1.50.

Némirovsky, Irène.—La Vie de Tchekov. *Paris*: A. Michel, 1946. 262 pp. Fr. 180.

Parker, Fan.—Vsevolod Garshin, a Study of a Russian Conscience. *New York*: King's Crown Press, 1946. viii + 86 pp. \$1.75.

Pushkin, A. S.—Two Short Stories, ed. Fruma Gottschalk. *Boston*: Heath, 1946. v + 72 pp. \$.48.

Sagovsky, Vladimir.—Russian for Beginners. *New York*: Pitman, 1946. xii + 188 pp. \$1.75.

Sieff, Mark.—Russian Reader. *London*: Routledge, 1946. xvi + 239 pp. 6 s.

Snow, Valentine.—Russian Writers; a bibliographical dictionary. 2 v. *New York*: Int. Bk. Service, 1946. v + 222 pp. \$3.75.

POLISH

Dynowska, Wanda.—Polish Short Stories. *Sucatantrapur, India*: Frydman, 1946. 160 pp.

Dynowska, W. and H. B. Bhatt.—Scarlet Muse; an Anthology of Polish Poems. *Bombay*: Tripathi, 1944. 125 pp.

Hamel, Bernard.—Introduction à la langue polonaise, grammaire pratique. *Paris*: Librairie polonaise (1946). 96 pp. Fr. 160.

1947

ational
, 1943,
l and
Press,
eneral.
itman,
ofisme.
Fr. 90.
-Rus.
1944.
rature
56 pp.
modern
ndom
Rus-
216
orous
don:
orky.
etical
1946.
etical
il.50.
ekov.
80.
tudy
ing's
75.
ed.
1946.
Be-
tii +
don:
bio-
ork:
3.75.
ries.
160
rlet
ems.
ague
Li-
160.

al
3,

nd
ss,

al.
n,

e.
0.

s.
4.

re
p.

m
m

s-
6

as
:

y.

al
3.

al
0.

r.

y
s

l.
3.

-
+

:

-
:

5.

s.
0

et
s.

ie
i-

0.

MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE SUMMER LANGUAGE SCHOOLS

MIDDLEBURY, VERMONT

JUNE 27 — AUGUST 14

FRENCH SCHOOL:

Vincent Guilloton, Director;
Claude Bourcier, Dean; Jean Gué-
henno, Visiting Professor

GERMAN SCHOOL:

Ernst Feise, Director; Werner
Neuse, Dean

ITALIAN SCHOOL:

Camillo Merlino, Director; Elio
Gianturco, Visiting Professor

RUSSIAN SCHOOL:

Mischa Fayer, Director

SPANISH SCHOOL:

Juan Centeno, Director; Jorge
Mafiach, Visiting Professor

FRENCH • GERMAN • ITALIAN RUSSIAN • SPANISH

Middlebury College's internationally famous Language Schools stress mastery of spoken, written language plus intimate knowledge of foreign country's life, institutions, literature, history, culture. Successful results due to Middlebury's unique, complete segregation from English contacts; pledged exclusive use of foreign language in and out of classes; separate school accommodations, native instructors—personalized supervision.

For Illustrated Bulletin, Information write:

OFFICE OF THE SUMMER SCHOOLS

Middlebury College, Middlebury 21, Vt.

THE MIND OF A POET

A STUDY OF WORDSWORTH'S THOUGHT
WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO

THE PRELUDE

By RAYMOND D. HAVENS

Fifteen years have gone into this search for the hiding places of a poet's power. There are chapters on the part matter-of-factness, passion, fear, wonder, solitude, silence, and loneliness, animism, nature, anti-rationalism, the mystic experience, religion, and imagination played in the thought and poetry of Wordsworth. Other topics are considered more briefly and *The Prelude*, the most illuminating account in English of the mind of a poet, is examined in detail. Theory has not been imposed on poetry but Wordsworth's beliefs have been deduced and explained from what he himself wrote and said.

xviii + 670 pages, two maps, buckram. \$5.00

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS BALTIMORE 18

SPOKEN ITALIAN

BASIC COURSE

By Vincenzo Cioffari

This text is designed for students aiming at fluency in Italian conversation in the shortest possible time. Practice in speaking and

listening gives the student mastery of about 850 basic words and aural understanding of about 500 more. Grammatical points are very clearly presented. Analysis is reduced to a minimum in early stages. The text itself provides for demonstration by a native speaker of Italian, and records covering the first twelve units are procurable from Henry Holt and Company. 443 pages. \$2.00

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

POE AS A LITERARY CRITIC

BY JOHN ESTEN COOKE

Edited with an introduction and notes

By N. BRYLLION FAGIN

This essay by the Virginia novelist John Esten Cooke, written a century ago, has just been published for the first time. It was discovered in a private collection and has now been edited with an introduction and notes by N. Bryllion Fagin of the John Hopkins University. Written immediately after Poe's death, the essay contains a vivid sketch of Poe as a lecturer and reflects contemporary opinion on Poe's life and work. This is a rare item of interest to all Poe collectors, libraries, and teachers of American literature. A facsimile of a page of the MS. is printed as a frontispiece. Price \$1.00.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND